One God, One Fayth.

OR F-13-29

A DISCOVRSE AGAINST

Thoſe Lukewarm-Chriſtians, who extend Saluation to all kinds of Fayth and Religion; ſo, that the Profeſſours do belieue in the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Paſſion &c. howſoeuer they differ in other inferiour Articles.

VVritten by VV. B. Prieſt.

BIB. CANT. ACAD.

One Lord, one Fayth, one God. *Epheſ.* 4.

Becauſe thou are Lukewarme, & neyther cold, nor hoat, I will vomit thee out of my mouth. *Apoc.* 3.

Permiſſu Superiorum. M. DC. XXV.

194:99

THE PREFACE
to the Reader.

GOOD READER,

Such are the lamentable Tymes, wherein we lyue, as that, they not only bring forth Men, who with great contention and heate of diſpute, do vndertake to mantayne particuler Errours, directly repugnant to the Scriptures, and the iudgment of Chriſt his Church; But alſo they affoard ſome others (as my owne experience aſſureth me, taken from my conuerſing with diuers ſuch, during my long endurance in England, and before my departure from thence) who are not affrayd to entertayne all Religions, with ſuch a cold Indifferency, as that they hould, that Saluation may be obtayned in any Religion, if ſo the Profeſſours

thereof do belieue only in the Trinity, the Incarnation, and ſuch fundamentall points of Chriſtianity; whether they be *Papiſts*, *Proteſtants*, *Anabaptiſts*, *Browniſts*, or any other of theſe later Sects. They heerupon further teach, that we are not obliged, vnder payne of any ſpirituall loſſe, to imbrace any one of theſe Religions, before another; ſcornefully traducing all others, who exact a more particuler, and articulate beliefe of our Chriſtian miſteryes.

And thus theſe ADIAPHORISTS in Religion (whoſe ſecret pulſe doth indeed beate vpon *Atheiſme*) diſclayme from all neceſſity of Truth, euen iuſtifying the defence of Errours, vnder the title of Errours; and houlding only this One mayne Controuerſy in Chriſtian Religion; to witt, *That in Chriſtian Religion, there are no mayne* CONTROVERSIES.

Againſt theſe *Ambi-dexter Chriſtians*, (ſo to call them) who drawe their Soules perdition in the ropes of a ſupine and careles ſecurity, I haue thought good to vndergoe the wryting of this ſhort enſuing Treatiſe, ſtyling it; *One God, one Fayth*, according to the words of the (1) Apoſtle; im-

(1) *Epheſ.* 4.

implying hereby, That, as there is but one God, and not many; ſo this one God wilbe truly worthipped (for the ſauing of our Soules) with one, only, entyre, and perfect Fayth, and not with multiplicity of Religions.

Now to make the paſſage more euen to this diſcourſe, by taking away ſome tacite Obiections, much inſiſted vpon to the contrary by our *Omni-fidians* in Religion, theſe men thus diſpute: God is moſt mercifull, & therefore it would be much repugnant to his infinite Mercy, to damne for all eternity, any Man that beleiueth in him, and in Ieſus Chriſt as his Redeemer; ſo that withall, he forbeare doing of all wrong, and do leade a vertuous (at leaſt a morall) lyfe; though in other Articles of leſſer importance, perhaps he may erre.

To this I anſwere with the Apoſtle: (2) *O altitudo diuitiarum ſapientiæ & ſcientiæ Dei?* Gods Iudgments are inſcrutable, and are to be admired, not to be ſearched after. Yf it was his diuine pleaſure, for one only Sinne (and that but in thought committed, as Deuines hould) to damne many thouſands of Angells for euer; If further he did not forbeare to puniſh all (2) Rom. 11.

Mankind with infinite Miſeryes for his firſt Parents fault, committed only in eating of a forbidden Aple; if laſtly it pleaſed hym, during ſeuerall thouſands of yeares, to make choyce only of the *Iewish Nation* (a handfull of the whole earth) for his elected People, and to ſuffer all the reſt of the world (till our Sauiours comming) to lye drowned in Idolatry, and to be damned, ſome few Gentills only excepted: And if alſo after our Sauiours Incarnation, he vouchſafed not for the ſpace of many ages to enlighten whole Countryes, with the Goſpell of Chriſt, but permitted them to continue (to their Soules eternall damnation) in their former Idolatry & Heatheniſme, yea ſuffering to this very day (& how long yet after, his diuine Maieſty only knoweth) diuers vaſt Countryes to perſeuere in their foreſaid Infidelity:

Yf now (I ſay) this proceeding in God is beſt lyking to himſelf, and that for the ſame, it were blaſphemy to charge him with Iniuſtice, or Cruelty (*For (3) ſhall the Clay ſay to hym that faſhioneth it, What makeſt thou?*) then dare any man expoſtulate God of Iniuſtice, and want of Mercy (for his diuine Goodnes

(3) Eſay. 45.

is nothing but Mercy and Iuſtice: (4) *miſericordia & veritas obuiauerunt ſibi, Iuſtitia & Pax oſculatæ ſunt:*) If he ſuffer men to periſh eternally for want of an entyre, complete, and perfect fayth in all the Articles of Chriſtianity, eſpecially in theſe tymes, when no Chriſtian can pretend for excuſe any inuincible ignorance in matters of Fayth, by reaſon, that all the true Articles of Chriſtian Religion are ſufficiently propounded, and diuulged by Gods Church to all Chriſtians whomeſoeuer? Therefore thouching Gods ſecret Iudgments, and diſpoſall in theſe matters, we will conclude, and confeſſe with the Prophet Eſay: (5) *Deus iudicij Dominus*.

(4) Pſalm. 84.

(5) Pſalm. 30.

This then being moſt true, from hence it appeareth, that diuers cold Proteſtants much wrong the Catholikes, in charging them with want of Charity, becauſe they will not acknowledg, that Proteſtāts dying Proteſtants, can be ſaued; whereas on the contrary part many learned Proteſtants (ſay they) do graunt the hope of Saluation to Catholikes, dying Catholikes, or (as now a dayes they terme them) Papiſts.

To this we reply: That heere is no

want of charity in the Catholikes, but rather a moſt vehement and burning Charity. For what greater Charity can there be, ſeing it is an vndeniable Truth, That Men dying in a falſe Faith, cannot be ſaued, then to premoniſh, and forewarne with all conuenient ſedulity and endeauour(6) *opportunè, importunè*, their Chriſtian Brethren of ſo great a danger, as the euerlaſting loſſe of their Soules cõmeth vnto? No; the ſoules interminable weale or woe is not a matter of Complement, that ſo for Ceremony, the remembrance thereof is to be forborne to be inculcated, and often ſpoken of; eſpecially where the moſt certaine truth of the matter inſiſted vpon, and the charitable intention of the ſpeaker, do warrant the diſcourſe.

(6) 2. Timoth. 4.

And if Catholikes muſt be cenſured vncharitable, for theſe their ſo wholeſome Admonitions; then by the ſame reaſon, the Apoſtle himſelfe is to be included within the like fault, who ſeuerely (7) chargeth vs, to flie the company & ſociety of an Heretike; & of him who (8) rangeth Schiſmes & Hereſyes among thoſe ſinnes, the workers whereof ſhall not attayne the Kingdome of God. In

(7) Tit. c. 3.

(8) Galat. 5.

like ſort, the auncient Fathers of Chriſts Church (I meane, *Auguſtin, Ambroſe, Ierome, Cyprian, Epiphanius*, & the reſt) muſt ſtand chargeable with the like want of Charity, for their anathematizing and condemning (both in generall Councells, and in their particuler writings, & Catalogues of Hereſies) all ſuch men, as did hould any erroneous opinions touching Fayth, againſt the then preſent Church of God.

But to returne more particulerly to the Subiect of this Treatiſe. The ſource from whence this *Libertiniſme* in belieſe (impugned heere by me) did take it origen and beginning, is the contempt of the authority of Chriſts Church, and the aſſumed authority of ech mans priuate Spirit. For thus reaſoneth the *Neutralliſt* in Religion: *Both the Papiſts and Proteſtants do agree in belieuing the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Paſſion &c. But they maynly diſſent touching Purgatory, praying to Saints, Freewill, Sacrifice of the Maſſe &c. Therefore I will imbrace and follow the acknowledged doctrine of them both* (meaning the Doctrine of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Paſſion) *and hould it neceſſary only to Saluation, ſince in it all ſides do conſpire. But ſeeing the diſſentions in religion emonge the Papiſts and the Proteſtants, are of*

theſe ſecondary and leſſe principall points only, (to wit, Purgatory, prayer to Saints &c.) *and ſeeing it is impoſsible, that both the Proteſtant and the Papiſt ſhould teach truly in the ſayd Articles* (*for they teach meere contrary doctrines therein, ſo as if the one ſide teach true, it neceßarily followeth, that the other ſide teacheth falſe:*) *And further; ſeeing I haue no more reaſon* (*once reiecting the authority of Gods viſible Church*) *to belieue the one partie, more then the other, and it is impoſsible for me to belieue them both: Therfore my priuat Spirit biddeth me to belieue neyther; but to hould the doctrines of Purgatory, prayer to Saints, Freewill, &c. and all other controuerted points of Fayth, at this day, betweene the Papiſt and the Proteſtant, to be matters meerely acceßory, and of ſuch indifferency, as that neyther the true, or falſe beliefe of them can further, nor hinder my Saluation.*

Thus farre argueth our *Newtralliſt*, who whyles he wilbe of all Religions, is indeed of no Religion. Then which (as if Religion were but a meere abſtracted *Notion in the mynd*) what can be excogitated to be more impious and Athieſtical in it ſelfe? more repugnāt to the ſacred Scriptures? more croſſe to the practiſe of all Antiquity? and (as heerafter ſhall be proued)

ued) more aduerſe to all naturall Reaſon?

But (*good Reader*) as vnwilling to trāſgreſſe the accuſtomed limits of a Preface, I will detayne thee no longer; only for ſome delibation, and taſt of the Subiect heerafter handled, I will conclude with the ſentence and iudgment of *S. Auguſtin*, paſſed vpon the *Pelagians*, who beliewed in the Trinity, in Chriſt, and his Paſſiō, were men of honeſt and morall conuerſation; yet for houlding, That only by the force of Nature, without the aſſiſtance of Gods grace, a Man was able to exerciſe vertue, & flie vice (a point no more fundamental, then moſt of the Cōtrouerſies betweene the Catholikes & the Proſtants) they are regiſtred for Heretikes by *S. Auguſtin*, and conſequently not to be (in his iudgment) in ſtate of Saluation: His words are theſe: (9) *Nec tales ſunt Pelagiani, quos facilè contēnas, ſed continenter viuentes, atque in omnibus operibus laudabiles: Nec falſum Chriſtum, ſed vnum, verum, aqualemq; Patri, & coaternum, veraciterq; hominem factum, & veniſſe credentes, & venturum expectantes; ſed tamen ignorantes Dei iuſtitiā, ſuam conſtituere volentes, Hæretici ſunt.* Thus *S. Auguſtin*, with whom I end, leauing thee

(9) Epiſt. 120. c. 37.

(Cur-

(*Curteous Reader*) to the deliberate, and
ſtudious peruſall of theſe enſuing Leaues,
and intreating moſt earneſtly the prayer
of all good Catholikes, for the remiſſion
of my infinite ſins, & for a happy houre
of the diſſolution of my old, and decayed
Body.

Thy Soules wellwishing
friend. VV. B. P.

THE

The Contents of the ensuing Treatise.

THAT a man, who believeth in the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Passion, &c. And yet believeth not all other Articles of Christiã Fayth, cannot be saued. And first of the definition of Heresy, and of an Heretike. Chap. 1. 1.

The foresayd Verity proued, from the Holy Scripture. Cap 2. 2.

The same proued from the definition, nature, and propriety of Vnity in Fayth. Cap. 3. 3.

The same proued, from the want of Vnity in Fayth, betweene the Catholike and the Protestant, touching the Articles of the Creed. Cap. 4. 4.

The same euident, from the like want of vnity in Fayth betweene the Catholike and Protestant, in Articles necessarily to be believed, and yet not expressed in the Creed. Cap. 5. 5.

The same proued from the authority, or priuiledge of Gods Church in not erring, eyther in her definitions of Fayth, or condemnation of Heresies; 6.

ſies; and firſt by Councells. Chap. 6.

7. The ſame proued from the like infallible authority of the Church in not erring, manifeſted from the teſtimonies of particuler Fathers. Cap. 7.

8. The foreſaid Truth euicted, from that Principle, that neither Heretikes, nor Schiſmatikes are members of the Church of God. Chap. 8.

9. The ſame proued, from the punishment anciētly inflicted vpon Heretikes, by the Church. Chap. 9.

10. The ſame proued, by arguments drawne from Reaſon. Chap. 10.

11. The ſame proued, from the different effects of Catholike Religion and Proteſtancy, touching Vertue and Vice. Chap. 11.

12. The ſame Veritie proued, from the feareful deaths of the firſt broachers of Proteſtancy. Ch. 12.

13. The ſame confirmed from the doctrine of Recuſancy, taught by Catholikes & Proteſtāts. Ch. 13.

14. The ſame manifeſted, from the writings of the Catholikes and Proteſtants, reciprocally charging one another with Hereſy; and from the Inſurrections, Warrs, and Rebellions begun only for Religion. Chap. 14.

15. The ſame proued from the Proteſtants mutuall condemning one another of Hereſy. Chap. 15.

16. The ſame demonſtrated, from the many abſurdities, neceſſarily accompanying the contrary doctrine. Chap. 16.

17. The Concluſion of the whole. Chap. 17.

THE

THAT A MAN, WHO BELIEVETH IN the Trinity, Incarnation, Paſsion &c. And yet believeth not all other Articles of Chriſtian fayth, cannot be ſaued. And firſt, of the definition of Hereſy, and an Heretike.

CHAP. I.

BEFORE we come (*good Reader*) to diſpute particulerly of the Subiect of this Diſcourſe, I hould it moſt conuenient in place of a ſhort *Prolegomenon*, or Preface, to prefixe, and ſet downe the true definition of Hereſy, or an Heretike, ſince this method will giue light to this whole enſuing Treatiſe, (diuers paſſages therof being principally founded vpon the definition, and nature of Hereſy,) and will beſt manifeſt, what opinions be Hereſyes, and what men, Heretikes; and conſequently, (ſeing Hereſy is incompatible with ſaluation, and cannot ſtand with the purchaſe of Heauen) will demonſtrate, that not any one Religion (profeſſing the name

name of Christians) which doth maintaine but one Heresy, can iustly promise to it selfe, the hope of Eternall life.

Well then, *Heresy*, or *Hæresis*, as we tearme it in Latin, is a Greeke word, signifying as much as, *Electio*, Election or Choyce; comming of the Greeke verbe αἱρεῖν, in Latine, *Eligo*, to *Choose*, or make Choyce of, as (a) Tertullian, and S. Jerome (b) do well note; so that this word *Hæresis*, originally, & primitiuely signifieth *Election* or *Choyce* (as is said) in generall, yet becauſe they, who deuide themselues by maintaining falſe opinions from the Church of Christ, do make choyce of theſe their new opinions, and so therby do separate themselues from the Church, therfore this word *Hæresis* (looſing it former generall signification) is restrayned by the Apoſtles, and the Ancient Fathers through an Eccleſiaſticall vſe, acceptance and appropriation (which courſe we finde houlden in diuers other wordes, not taken by the Church, in a secondary acception) to signifie anie falſe, or new opinion in Religion among Christians of which a man maketh choyce, & pertinacionsly defendeth againſt the Church of God; and the maintainers therof are

(a) *lib. de præſcript. c. 6.*

(b) *in c. 5. Epiſt. ad Galat.*

con

commonly ſtyled, *Heretikes*. Thus three things neceſſarily concurre, to make any falſe opinion, *Hereſy*, and the defendours therof *Heretikes*. Firſt, it muſt be ſome errour touching the Faith of Chriſt: And the reaſon hereof is, becauſe he that neuer profeſſed or imbraced the Chriſtian Faith, is not an *Heretike*, though he erre, but a *Iew*, or a *Pagan*, and *Heathen*. This is the doctrine of S. (c) Thomas, & of all learned men. The ſecond condition neceſſarily concurring to euery Hereſy is, that there be an erreneous iudgment in the vnderſtanding of him, who maintayneth the Hereſie; from whence it followeth, that an externall deniall of a mans Faith, is not Hereſy, except it proceed from an interiall errour of the vnderſtanding; but is rather to be accompted diſſimulation, or ſchiſme, as S. Thomas (d) teacheth.

(c) *quæſt.* 11. *art.* 2.

(d) *quæſt.* 10. 2. 2.

The third and laſt condition is, that this errour be maintained with great obſtinacie againſt the authority of Chriſts Church, teaching the contrarie doctrine, and that the defendour therof being admoniſhed of his errour, will neuertheleſſe openly reſiſt the authority of the Church therin, ſeeing, if he be admoniſhed by the Church of his errour, and inſtantly therupon do forſake his falſe opinion, he is to be accompted,

only erroneous, and his falſe doctrine only an *Errour*.

(e) l. 18. de ciuit. Dei. c. 51.

This agreeth to that of S. Auguſtine: (e) *Qui in Eccleſia Chriſti aliquid prauum ſapiunt, ſi correpti, vt ſanum rectumque ſapiant, reſiſtant contumaciter, ſuaque peſtifera & mortifera dogmata emendare nolunt, ſed defenſare perſiſtant, Hæretici fiunt; & foras exeuntes, habentur in exercentibus Hæreticis.* That is, *Who beleiue any falſe or wrong opinion in the Church of Chriſt, and being counſailed and admonished therof, do contumaciouſly and ſtubbornly reſiſt, and will not recall their peſtiferous and deadly opinions, but do perſiſt in defending of them, they are therby become Heretikes; and ſo departing out of the Church, they are taken for ſuch, as vent forth open, and willfull Hereſies.* Thus S. Auguſtine.

This Conſtruction (both touching the foreſaid definition of Hereſy, in taking the words *Hæreſis*, and *Hæreticus*, in an euill re-ſtrayned, and appropriated ſenſe) is warranted by the Apoſtle, by the Auncient Fathers, and laſtly (to omit the like acknowledged iudgment of the Catholikes) by the learned Proteſtants. By the (f) Apoſtle: for thus we find him to ſay: *There muſt be Hereſies among you, that they which are approoued among you, may be knowne.* Againe; (g) *The workes of the flesh are manifeſt, which are adulterie, fornication &c. ſeditions, Hereſies &c.* As alſo,

(f) 1. Cor. 11.

(g) Galat. 5. 19. vid. e Teſtam. noſtram. 1576.

lso (h) *A man, that is an Heretike, after the first & second admonition, auoyde.* And (i) finally: *Thoſe, which were of the Hereſie of the Sadducees &c. laid hands vpon the Apoſtles.*

(h) *Tit. 3.*
(i) *Act. 5.*

By the Auncient Fathers: For S. Ierome (k) ſhewing the difference betweene Hereſie and Schiſme, thus defineth Hereſie: *Hæreſis eſt, quæ peruerſum dogma habet. Hereſie is that which containeth a peruerſe & froward opinion.* And S. Auguſtine (l) defineth Hereſies in theſe wordes: *Hæretici ſunt qui de Deo falſa ſentiendo, fidem violant. Heretikes are thoſe, who do violate their faith, by houlding falſe opinions touching God.*

(k) *in ca. 3. ad Titum.*
(l) *l. de fide & ſimbolo. ca. 10.*

By the Proteſtants: For to name one or two among many, M. (m) Ormerod a moſt forward Proteſtant, thus defineth an Heretike: *He is an Heretike, who ſo ſwarueth from the wholeſome doctrine, as contemning the iudgment of God, and the Church, perſiſteth in his opinion &c.* With whom conſpireth D. Couell (n) ſaying: *Heretikes are they, who directly gainſay ſome article of our faith.*

(m) *Dial. 2.*
(n) *Exam. p. 199.*

Now, out of this former definition of Hereſie, I am to promoniſh the Reader of three pointes (the which in the peruſing of this Treatiſe, I would haue him often to call to remembrance:) firſt that euery Hereſy is maintained (as is aboue taught) with obſtinacie, againſt the authoritie of

the Church of God, and therfore the main
(o) Ioan. 2. 19. tayners therof are said by the Apostle, (o) *that they went out of vs*, that is, out of God
Church: and for the same reason the Apo
(p) Tit. 3. stle (p) doth pronounce an Heretike, *to be condemned by his owne iudgment*; because he preferreth his iudgment, before the iudgment of the whole Church. From which consideration it followeth, that what ma soeuer houldeth an erroneous opinion touching Christian Faith, and being a uertized therof by Gods Church, and n captiuating his iudgment in all humili therto, is therby become an Heretike. An such is the state of Catholikes and Prot stants; since the one doth euer reciprocal charge and condemne the other with fal doctrine; and therfore seing the Church Christ must be with the one of them, it fo loweth, that the other not submitting the iudgment to it, are proclaymed therby H tetikes. And thus it may sometimes fall o that the first Inuentour of a false opini may be no Heretike, as maintayning it b fore it be condemned by the Chur wheras the Professours of it, after its co demnation, are become Heretikes; acc
(q) l. aduersus Hæres. ding to that of (q) Vincentius Lyrinen *O admirable change of things! the authours of and the same opinion are esteemed Catholikes;*

their followers are iudged Heretikes: Thus we ſee that pertinacity of iudgment doth euer conſumate an Hereſy.

The ſecond, that the denyall of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Paſſion &c. are not properly called Hereſies, but rather blaſphemies; & the denyers of them not to be accouned Heretikes, but Infidels, Iewes or Pagans. From whence it proceedeth that what places of Scripture, or of the Fathers are ſpoken of Heretiks, the ſame cannot be truly applyed to the denyers of the Trinity, the Incarnation, Paſſion &c.

The third is, that the forſayd definition of Hereſy (being the only true definition, and acknowledged for ſuch on all ſides) is not reſtrayned eyther in it ſelfe, or by the meaning of the Apoſtle, only to the moſt ſupreme, & (as they are called) fundamental points of Chriſtian Fayth, as of the Trinity, the Incarnation of Chriſt, his paſſion, the Decalogue, and the Articles of the Creed; but it is extended, in it own nature (conſidering that according to al *Art*, the definitiõ and the thing defined, ought to be of an equall latitude or extent) to any erroneous opinion whatſoeuer, frowardly defended by a man, and impugned by the Church of God: So, as it is as perfit an Hereſy (and the belieuers therof are as true Heretikes) to

deny that there is a Purgatory, or to deny Freewill, praying to Saints, the doctrine of Indulgences, the necessity of Baptisme, or any other Article affirmed by Catholikes (granting the doctrine of Catholiks in these Articles to be true) as to deny the Trinity, the Incarnatiō of Christ, his death, Passion &c. suppoſing the denyall of theſe to be but Hereſies. And a man ſhalbe aſwell damned inHell for denying theſe former, as for theſe other; though the denyall of theſe latter do exceed the other in malice, ſince the blaſphemies of them are in themſelues more wicked & heynous. And thus much touching the definition of *Hereſy*, or an *Heretik*, which being iuſtly premiſed, we will come now to the mayne Controuerſy handled in this Treatiſe.

THAT EVERY CHRISTIAN CANNOT be ſaued in his owne Religion: Proued from the holy Scripture.

CHAP. II.

NOw then to beginne to fortify and warrant this vndoubted truth, *that every Chriſtian cannot be ſaued in his owne Religion*, I will draw my firſt kind of Proofe frō the ſacred wordes of holy Scripture. And theſe teſtimonies ſhalbe of three ſorts; One cōcerning Heretikes textes which are not reſtr-

ned to any particular Hereſies, but deliuered of Hereſy in generall. The ſecond branch of authorities ſhall touch Heretikes, euen for certaine particuler Hereſies, differente from denying the Trinity, the Incarnation of our Sauiour, his Paſſion, & other like principall and fundamentall articles of Chriſtian Religion. The third ſhall containe the neceſſity and dignity of Fayth, without any reſtriction to the pointes or articles, which are to be belieued.

And firſt to beginne with the firſt: We read the Apoſtle thus to ſpeake of an Heretike in generall: (a) *A man that is an Heretike, after the firſt or ſecond admonition auoyd, knowing that he, that is ſuch, is ſubuerted, and ſinneth, being condemned by his owne iudgment.* Where (we ſee) the Apoſtle commaundeth vs *to auoid an Heretike*; which he would neuer haue done, if the ſayd Heretike had bin in ſtate of Saluation: The Apoſtle further adding this reaſon, *in that he ſinneth*, and in that ſuch a mã, as being a pertinacious & willfull Heretike, *is condemned by his owne proper iudgment*; that is, becauſe he aduaunceth his own iudgment aboue the iudgment of Gods Church; and becauſe he needeth not that publike cõdemnation of the Church, which vpon other offenders by way of Excommunication is inflicted. Of which text of the Apo-

(a) *Epiſt. ad Tit. 3.*

ſtle, Tertullian both pithily and excellently giueth his gloſſe ſaying: (b) *Quia & in q damnatur, ſibi elegit.*

(b) *Lib. de præſcript. c. 6.*

Moreouer the Apoſtle elſewhere coniu reth (as it were) in the name of Chriſt, tha we ſhould auoyd all falſe belieuers in thes words: (c) *We denounce vnto yow (Bretbren) i the name of our Lord Ieſus Chriſt, that you with draw your ſelues from euery Brother walking in ordinatly, and not according to the Tradition, whic they haue receiued of vs.* This place concerneth Fayth and doctrine (as the whole Chapte ſheweth:) But if thoſe men heere to be e chewed, were in ſtate of Saluation, the ought not then to be eſchewed. Agayne this text cannot haue referēce to thoſe, wh deny the Trinity, Incarnation, and Paſſiō ſeeing the denyers of thoſe high Article are not Brethren in Chriſt; and yet the A poſtle ſtyleth them *Brethren*, whom he heer reprehendeth. The Apoſtle alſo in anothe place thus forewarneth: (d) *The workes of t flesh be manifeſt, which are fornication, vncleann impurity &c. diſſentions (*) Sects &c. They whi do theſe things shal not obtayne the kingdom of Go* where we ſee, there is expreſſe mentio made of *Sects*, and that the maintainers any Sects in opinion of Fayth, much mo of any Hereſy (which is euer auerred wi greater contumacy and frowardnes, an

(c) 2. *Theſſ. cap. 3.*

(d) *Epiſt. ad Galat. c. 5.*

(*) or Hereſies, *according to the Teſtament of an. 1576.*

wi

with neglect to the Churches Authority) shall not enter into the kingdome of Heauen: From which testimony we may further conclude, that as one only act of fornication barreth a man from the kingdome of God, so also one Heresy excludeth him frō the same.

A fourth place is this: (e) *I desire you Brethren, to marke them that make dissentions, and scandalls, contrary to the doctrine which you haue learned, and auoyd them; for such do not serue Christ our Lord.* But if such men be to be auoyded, and *do not serue Christ*, then no doubt they continuing in that state, cannot be saued. (e) Epist. ad Rom. c. 16.

Fiftly, the Apostle speaketh of certaine men, saying of them: (f) *Quidam circa fidem naufragauerunt: Certaine men haue made shipwracke of their Fayth.* Where the Apostle vseth the Metaphore of *shipwracke*, therby to expresse more fully, that Heretikes once falling out of the shippe of the Church of Christ, are cast into the sea of eternall damnation. (f) 1. Tim. 1.

To conclude, the Euāgelist S. Iohn speaketh of all Heretikes in generall, not imbracing the Doctrine of Christ (within which all secondary questions of Christian Religion are contayned) in this sort: *If any man (g) come to you, and bring not the doctrine of* (g) 2. Ioan.

Christ, receaue him not into your house, nor say God saue you, vnto him. But a man is bound charity to suffer any one, which is in st of Saluation, to come into his house and salute him, or say, *God saue him.* Now wh can be replyed against these former texts? cannot be sayd, that they are meant only such Heretikes, as deny the mysteries of t Trinity, the Incarnation of Christ, Passion, and such like supreme points Christian Religion. This (I say) cannot auerred, for these reasons following: Fi because those, who in the Apostles tym denyed these principall points of Christi nity, could not be truly termed Heretike but rather Iewes or Heathens; seeing he an Heretike truly (as is aboue shewed) wh was once a member of Christs Church b Fayth, but after ceaseth to be therof, by e ring in some secondary points, touchin Christian Fayth. Secondly, by reason tha (according to the true definition of Heres or Heretikes, aboue set downe) the forme texts haue a necessary reference to all He relies and Heretikes whatsoeuer, whethe the subiect of the sayd false opinions be sma or great. Thirdly, because that in the for mer texts of Scripture there is no restriction of the word *Hæreticus*, or *Hæresis*, to the chiefe or highest points of Christian Reli-

gion

ſe, nor ſ gion; but it is extended to all kind of Here-
s bound ikes and Hereſies whatſoeuer, euen by the
is in ſt Apoſtle without exceptiõ; who (no doubt)
ouſe and if he had vnderſtood Heretikes, or Hereſies
Now wh only in the greateſt points (admitting ſuch
er texts? mẽ for Heretikes) would accordingly haue
int only reſtrayned his words (at leaſt in ſome one
eries of t text or other among ſo many) only to theſe
hriſt, h kind of Heretikes. But not to leaue the leaſt
points (hew of refuge or euaſion herein, I will pro-
cannot duce ſome paſſage of holy Scripture, in wch
ng: Fi he mantayners of particuler errours, euen
les tym in leſſer points, then the higheſt articles of
Chriſti Chriſtianity, are cenſured by Chriſts Apo-
Heretike ſtles, to be depriued of eternall Saluation.
eing he And firſt we find S. Paul thus to pro-
ved) wh phesie: *In the later* (h) *times, certaine ſhall depart*
nurch b *from the Fayth, attending to ſpirits of errour, and*
f, by e *doctrine of deuills, and forbidding to marry, and to*
touchin *abſtaine from meates &c.* Heere the Apoſtle
aſon th propheſieth (according to the iudgment of
f Hereſ (i) S. Chryſoſtom (k) Ambroſe (l) Ierom, &
e forme (m) Auguſtin) of the Heretikes Encratites,
all He Marcioniſtes, Ebionites &c. who denyed
whethe matrimony, as a thing altogeather vnlaw-
be ſma full, & prohibited abſolutly, and at all times
the for the eating of certaine meates, as creatures
triction impure: Now theſe Heretikes belieued in
to the the Trinity, the Incarnation &c. yet euen
n Reli- for theſe two former Hereſies, touching ma-
gion riage

(h) 1. Tim. cap. 4.

(i) Hom. 12. in 1. Tim.
(k) Vpon this place.
(l) l. contra Iouin. cap. 1.
(m) Hær. 25. & 40.

riage and eating of meates, they are sayd b
the Apostle to *depart from the Fayth of Chri*
and to attend to the doctrine of deuills. But suc
as leaue the Fayth of Christ, and atten
to the doctrine of Diuells, are not i
state of Saluation. In my iudgement, th
one authority alone is sufficient to oue
throw this phantasie of our *Newtrallists*
since the words are diuine Scripture, th
Heresies reprehended no fundamenta
points of Religion, but of as little or lesse
consequence, then the Controuersies be
wixt the Catholikes and the Protestants: &
yet the maintainers of them are accomp
ted to *depart from the Fayth of Christ, and to at*
tend to the doctrine of deuills.

A second place shalbe that of the for
mer Apostle; who writing of certayn
Heretikes erring, touching the Resurre
ction of the Body (though the article o
the Resurrection it selfe they belieued)
(n) 2. Tim. cap. 2. sayth thus: (n) *Their speach spreadeth like a Canker, of whome is Hymenæus and Philetus, who haue erred from the truth, saying, That the Resurrection is allready past, and haue subuerted the Fayth of some.* These men belieued all the mysteries of the Trinity, the Incarnatiõ &c. yet for erring only, touching the Re
surrection of the body, they are sayd to *erre from the truth, to subuert the Fayth of some:* and

that

hat as Canker neuer leaueth the body, till y little and little it wasteth it away; so heir speaches by degrees, poyson and kill he soules of the hearers. From which it uidently followeth, that these Heretikes ontinuing and dying in the foresaid Here- e could not be saued: since that faith, *which rreth from the truth, which subuerteth the true aith of Christ in others, and which in killing and estroying resembleth a Canker*, cannot affoard Saluation to its Professours.

Another passage, which heere I will vrge, is that of S. Iohn, who calleth certaine Heretikes, *Antichrists*, saying: (o) *Now there are become many Antichrists, who went out of vs, & were not of vs; for if they had byn of vs, they would surely haue remayned with vs.* These Heretikes beliued in the Trinity, in the Incarnation of Christ, that he dyed for the saluation of the whole world; & only they erred touching the Person & Natures of Christ; & yet they are figuratiuely stiled *Antichrists*, and are *said to depart* out of the Church of Christ; but no saluation is reserued for *Antichrists* and *Apostataes, leauing the Church of Christ.* And thus much out of Gods holy Writ, expressely touching Heresie in generall, & particuler.

(o) 1. Ioan. c. 2.

To these Texts I will adioyne (though not immediately and directly raunged vnder the former head) a place or two of Scripture

pture, in my iudgment moſt vnanſwe-
rable, and by neceſſarie inference, euicting
the point heere vndertakē. The firſt place is
(p) 2. Ep. c. 3. thoſe words of S. Peter, where he ſaith: (p) *In the Epiſtles of S. Paul, there are certaine things hard to be vnderſtood, which the vnlearned and vnſtable do peruert vnto their owne deſtruction.* Now heere I thus argue: But theſe thinges hard to be vnderſtood in S. Paul his Epiſtles, did not concerne the doctrine of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Paſſion &c. and yet the miſvnderſtanding of them doth cauſe (as the text ſaith) *the deſtruction*, that is the damnation of them, who miſunderſtand them. Therfore farre leſſer points then the deniall of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Paſſion &c. doe iuſtly threaten to the falſe belieuers of them, dānation; and conſequently it followeth, that a bare beliefe of thoſe ſupreme points is not ſufficient to Saluation.

That thoſe difficulties in S. Paules Epiſtles, intimated by S. Peter, did not concerne the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Paſſion &c. I prooue ſeuerall wayes: firſt becauſe S. Peter maketh no ſuch mention, which no doubt he would haue done, if the ſubiect of them had only touched thoſe ſupreme myſteries, and were not to be extended to other inferiour pointes. Secondly,

y, it is acknowledged by the writings and ommentaries of all the Fathers (besides at the Epistles themselues shew no lesse) at S. Paul is most euident and cleere in l his Epistles touching the Trinity, the carnation, the Passion &c. and therfore ere is no reason, why the difficulties of em should be applyed to those articles, uch lesse restrayned to them alone.

Thirdly, the Fathers do vnderstand these fficulties in S. Paul his Epistles mentio-ed by S. Peter, chiefly touching Iustifica-ō, as appareth by the testimony euen of S. ugustine (q) himselfe, who particulerly stanceth in that place 1. Corinth. 3. *If y man build vpon this foundation, gold, siluer,* c. (which text intreateth of Iustification d workes) and expresly saith, that this is e of the difficult passages intended, and eant by S. Peter. With S. Augustine, S. rome may seeme well to agree in these ords: (r) *Epistola ad Romanos nimijs obscuri-tibus inuoluta est:* The Epistle to the Ro-ans is inuolued with many obscurities, or arke places: for it is found, that the Epi-le to the Romans most entreateth of Iu-ification, and of faith, and workes. Four-ly and lastly, the Protestants themselues vnderstand the said obscurities of S. Paul s Epistles touching Iustification, as ap-

(q) *l. de fide & operibus. c. 15. & 16.*

(r) *Epist. ad Algasiam quæ. 8.*

peareth

peareth (to omit the testimonies of
others herein) from the words, and Com
ment of Doctor Fulke against the Rh
mish Testament, vpon the foresaid pla
of S. Peter. And this farre of this text, whe
we find by an ineuitable deduction, that
false Fayth touching Iustification only, ca
not stand with Saluation.

The second text of scripture is contain
in those words of the Apostle, where
thus sayth: (s) *Credere oportet accedentem ad D*
quia est, & inquirentibus se remunerator sit :
that commeth to God, must beleiue that God
and is a rewarder to them that seeke him. Hee
is imposed a necessity (as appeareth by t
word *oportet*) to beleiue not only, that the
is a God, but that this God giueth rewar
to such as seeke him, to wit, eternall ly
But to beleiue, that *God is a rewarder of g*
men, is an article in it selfe wholy distinct,
differēt from the articles of the Trinity, t
Incarnation, the Passion &c. and in natu
independent of these other: for a man m
beleiue, that God is a rewarder of good m
with eternall felicity, and yet not belie
these other supreme Mysteryes, as man
vertuous men (no doubt) did in the law
nature, and in the time of the old Test
ment; and on the contrary side, a man m
beleiue those chiefe articles of Christianity

(c) c. 11. ad Hebræos.

an

and yet not particulerly belieue, that God is a rewarder of ſuch as ſeeke him. And yet we ſee, the beliefe of this later point is neceſſarily exacted by the Apoſtle of all thoſe, *who come to God*; & conſequently of all thoſe who ſhalbe ſaued, ſeeing no man can be ſaued, but ſuch as come to God.

THE SAME PROVED, FROM THE DEfinition, Nature, and Propriety of Fayth.

CHAP. III.

IN this place we ſhall firſt take into our conſideration the definition of fayth ſet downe by S. Paul. Secondly, the dignity & worth of Fayth, much celebrated by diuers of the Apoſtles. Thirdly, the inſeparable propriety of Fayth, which is *Vnity*, for ſo doth the Scripture delineate, and deſcribe Fayth: From all which it will ineuitably follow, that, that Fayth which ſaueth man, is not to be reſtrayned only to the Trinity, the Incarnation, and other ſuch ſublime points of Chriſtian Religion (though in other points it be erroneous) but to all points whatſoeuer, which the Church of God propoundeth to be belieued.

And to beginne with the definition of

Fayth giuen by the Apoſtle: He thus de
neth Fayth: (a) *Fayth is the ſubſtance of thi*
to be hoped for, the argument of things not app
ring. The ſenſe wherof is this: firſt, th
Fayth through an infallible certainty, ca
ſeth thoſe things to ſubſiſt, and haue a b
ing in the mind of man, which are
to come, but hoped and looked for. S
condly, that fayth cauſeth the vnderſta
ding to giue an aſſent to thoſe points whi
it vnderſtandeth not; acknowledging the
to be more certaine, then any other thi
whatſoeuer, according to thoſe words of
Thomas: (b) *Multo magis homo certior eſt de eo q*
audit à Deo, qui falli non poteſt, quàm de eo qu
videt propria ratione, quæ falli poteſt. Now hee
I truſt no man wil deny, but the Apoſtle d
fined that Fayth of a Chriſtian, which ſ
ueth him. This being graunted (for to den
it were both impious in the denier, & mo
iniurious to the Apoſtle) we are to remem
ber the nature of euery true definition, ſ
downe by the Logitians, to wit (as is
boue intimated) that the thing defined, an
the definition be of one and the ſame exte
& latitude, ſo as whatſoeuer is comprehe
ded vnder the definitiõ, the ſame is alſo co
tayned vnder the thing defined. This the
being preſuppoſed by force of all reaſon (fo
Logike is but an artificiall hãdmaid to Rea
ſon)

(a) c. 11. ad Hebræos.

(b) quæſt. 4. art. 8.

n) we find, that this definition of Fayth
ompriseth in it selfe, not only the Doctri-
e of the Trinity, of the Incarnation, &c.
and this, not articulately, but only by way
deduction) but also it containeth all se-
ndary points of Religion: seeing the for-
er definition doth predicate, or may be
yd of all the sayd secondary and lesse prin-
pall points of Religion, controuerted bet-
eene Christians at any time. Therfore the
ing heere defined, which is the sauing
ayth of a Christian, is in like sort to ex-
nd it selfe to all the sayd secondary points
Religion, how indifferent soeuer they
me in mans iudgment. This inference is
demonstratiue, being taken from the for-
er definition of Fayth, as that the Apostle
mselfe presently after the former words,
ginning to instance the seueral Obiect of
ayth (among diuers other examples) set-
th downe, that to belieue Noahs floud,
the deluge of the world by water, for
ne, is an article of Fayth: for thus he
yth: *By Fayth (c) Noah hauing receaued an ans-*
ere concerning those things, which as yet were
seene, fearing, framed the Arke for the sauing of
is howse.

(c) Hebr. 11.

But to proceed further; If the Articles of
e Trinity, the Incarnation, and the like
e the only essentiall points of a true Chri-

ſtian Fayth, it is more then wonderfull that the Apoſtle vndertaking to ſet down the true definition of an auailable Fayth and exemplifying it in it ſeuerall Obiects ſhould wholy and ſilently omit the ſay articles of the Trinity, Incarnation, Paſſi &c. he in that Chapter not expreſly ſpe king one word of them.

And thus much touching the definitio of Fayth giuen by the Apoſtle; from whi definition we conclude, that whoſoeu ſeeketh to haue a true Fayth neceſſary to ſa uation, muſt belieue (beſides the myſteri of the Trinity, the Incarnation &c.) diue others dogmaticall articles of Chriſtian R ligion. And therfore anſwereably ther we aſſure our ſelues, that when our Sauio ſayd: *He* (d) *that belieueth not, shalbe condemne* he did ſpeake of the believing of the who corps of Chriſtian Fayth and Doctrine, a not only of any part therof; for ſo in this ter maner it would be both falſe & abſur In like fort, where our Bleſſed Sauiour the ſame Chapter ſayth to his Apoſtle *Preach the Ghoſpell to all creatures &c.* He vnderſtand the whole Ghoſpell, which tayneth many other points, beſides the T nity, Incarnation, and Paſſion, &c.

(d) *Marc.* 16.

In this next place we will deſcend thoſe paſſages of holy Scripture, which

much magnify the efficacy and vertue of fayth: And accordingly heerto we find it is said: (e) *He that belieueth, and is baptized, shalbe saued; but he that belieueth not, shalbe condemned*. Againe our Sauiour said to the blind men, praying to receaue their sight: (f) *According to your faith be it donne vnto you:* And further: (g) *Without fayth it is impossible to please God.* And more: (h) *Our fayth is the victorie, which ouercommeth the world:* Now in these and many other such texts, for breuity omitted, I demaund, what fayth is vnderstood or meant? If it be answered, a true, entyre & perfect faith, belieuing all points of Christian Religion proposed by Gods Church; it is true, and that, which I heare seeke to prooue: Yf an vnperfect and mundell faith, belieuing some points of Christian Religion, and reiecting others, and so erroneus faith, being partly true, partly false; I say it can neuer deserue these prayses given by the Euangelists and Apostles, neither can it produce such supernaturall effects aboue specifyed; no more then darkeness can produce light: since Truth himselfe hath taught vs: (i) *That we cannot gather figges of thornes, nor grapes of bushes.* And hence by premises we are to vnderstand, that we can entyre & perfect fayth, that, by the which we belieue all supreme articles of

(e) *Marc. vlt.*

(f) *Mat. 9.*

(g) *Hebr. c. 11.*

(h) *1. Ioan. c. 5.*

(i) *Luc. 6.*

the Trinitie, Incarnation, Paſſion &c. and all the articles of the Creed, expreſſely & articulately in their true ſenſe; and do believe all other inferiour articles, at leaſt implicitely; that is, that we haue a readie preparation of mind to believe all other articles, which the Church of Chriſt doth propound to be believed; ſo as, that though we do not believe euery article of Chriſtian Religion with an explicite and expreſſe faith, yet we are bound vnder paine of damnation, not to believe any doctrine contrary or repugnant to the ſaid articles which the Church of Chriſt doth propound to be believed: from which it vndoubtedly followeth, that once graunting that the Church of Chriſt propoundeth to be believed, that there is a Purgatory, or that we may pray to the Saints, he incureth damnation who believeth that there is no Purgatory, or that we ought not to pray to Saints.

Now in this third place, we will touch that inſeparable Attribute of true Chriſtian fayth, which is *Vnity* in fayth & doctrine. This marke is ſo indiſſolubly annexed to the true fayth of Chriſt, as that we find his Apoſtles euer readie moſt earneſtly to inculcate the ſame to their diſciples. Thus accordingly the Apoſtle exhorted

exhorteth the Ephesians, saying: (k) *Be you carefull to keepe the vnity of the spirit, in the bond of peace.* And immediately againe. (l) *There is one Lord, one fayth, one Baptisme.* Where we see, that *Vnity in fayth* is expressely set downe. As also in another place: (m) *I beseech you, that you speake all one thing: be you knit together in one mind and one iudgment.* And as this was the exhortation of the Apostle, so we read that the first beleiuers followed the same, of whom S. Luke thus saith: *The (n) multitude that belieued, were of one hart, and one soule.* And hence it proceedeth, that the Church of Christ (which comprehendeth the Professours of this vnanimous faith) is styled by Gods holy writ, (o) *One Bodie, one (p) Spouse,* &, (q) *& one flocke of sheepe.* A truth so euident, as that (besides the frequent testimonies of the Fathers (r) confirming the same) euer the Protestants subscribe in iudgment heerto. For thus (s) Luther himselfe (to omit (t) others) writeth: *A kingdome deuided in it selfe, shall not stand; neither haue any Heretikes at any tyme bine ouercome by force or subtility, but by mutuall dissention; neither doth Christ fight with them otherwise, then with a spirit of giddines, and disagreement.*

Now then, this *Vnitie of faith* is so to be vnderstood, as that it is not repugnant therto,

(k) Ephes. 4.
(l) Ephes. vbi supra.
(m) Ephes. loc. cit.
(n) Act. 4.
(o) Rom. 12.
(p) Cant. 6.
(q) Ioan. 10.
(r) Athanasius orat. 1. con. Ari. Chrysost. opere imperfecto in Mat. Hom. 20. Tertullian de præscript. Irenæus l. 1. c. 5.
(s) Luther tom. 3. Wittenberg in psal. 5. fol. 166.
(t) see her.

of the Deuines of Mansfeild against the Sacramentaries; And the Deuines of Heidelberg against the Anabaptists.

therto, that one and the ſame point ſhould at one time, not be houlden as neceſſary to be belieued; the which after it hath vndergone a definitiue & ſententionall decree of Gods Church, is neceſſarily to be belieued. As for example, it was not neceſſary in the beginning of Chriſtianity to belieue, that the booke of the Machabees, the Epiſtle of S. Iames, S. Iude, the ſecond Epiſtle of S. Peter, the ſecond and third of S. Iohn to be Canonicall Scripture, till they were defined ſo to be by the third Councell(u) of Carthage, at which S. Auguſtine was preſent; But after this Councell had, by the aſſiſtance of the holy Ghoſt, defined them to be Canonicall, and this after confirmed by the conſent of the whole Church; then it was, and is Hereſy to deny them to be Canonicall. And the reaſon of this diſparity is, becauſe it is Gods good pleaſure & wiſdome, not to reueale to his Church all articles of faith in the beginning, and at one time, but at ſeuerall times, and vpon ſeuerall occaſions, as to his diuine Maieſty beſt ſeemeth expedient.

(u) Can. 47.

Thus the fayth of a Chriſtian is capable of dilatation, and of a more large vnfoulding, or expoſition; but not of any contrariety in beliefe, chaunge, or alteration. And thus (to inſiſt in the former example) y

may well ſtand with Chriſtian faith, in the beginning not to accept the former bookes for Canonicall, till the authority of the Church had pronounced them for ſuch. But it ſtandeth not with ſound faith, that one man ſhould poſitiuely belieue (now after the Churches definition therof giuen) as an article of fayth, that the Machabees and the reſt of the bookes aboue ſpecified, are not Canonicall Scripture, but the prophane writings of man; and another man should belieue, as an article of Faith, that they are Canonicall Scripture; ſince the one of theſe contrary beleifes muſt be Hereticall.

This verity of the *Vnity* of faith being warranted by the word both of God and man (as is aboue ſaid) we will take into our conſideration the Catholike and Proteſtant Religions, both which ioyntly do profeſſe to belieue in generall, in the Trinity, in Chriſts Incarnation, his Paſſion, and the Creed of the Apoſtles; and ſo we ſhall diſcerne whether the faith of all theſe ſeuerall Profeſſours doth inioy the foreſaid marke of *vnity* in doctrine or noe. But ſeing this Subiect is moſt ample and large, I will therfore ſepoſe this enſuing chapter for the more full and exact diſcouery of the many and great diſagreements betweene the Catholikes and the Proteſtants in their fayth and Religion.

THE SAME PROVED FRO
want of vnity in fayth, betweene Catholikes a
Protestants, touching the Articles of the Creed

CHAP. IIII.

VNDERTAKING in this place t
set downe the multiplicity of op
nions, betweene Catholikes an
Protestants, though they all ioint
ly belieue in the Trinity, the Incarnation o
Christ, his Passion, and the like; and conse
quently, that this their general beliefe wan
teth that true *Vnity* of fayth, which out of th
holy Scriptures, Fathers, & the Protestants
I haue aboue shewed to be most necessar
to Saluation; I will first examine, how th
Protestants and Catholikes doe differ tou
ching the *beliefe of the Creed*, made by the A
postles. Next I will demonstrate, that sup
posing all Professours of both Religion
should agree in the true sense and meanin
of the Creed; yet there are diuers other dog
maticall points necessarily to be belieued,
(and are at this instant belieued both by
Protestants and Catholikes) which are not
expressed or mentioned in the Creed, nor
by any immediate inference can be drawne
from thence. Lastly I wil set down the great
difference betweene Catholiks & Protestats
in

in other points of fayth, of which the Creed makes no intimation or mention at al; and yet the different beliefe of them is houlden neceſſary to Saluatiõ, both by Catholike & Proteſtant. From all which it ſhall appeare, how farre diſtant the Catholike and Proteſtant Religion are from that *vnity* in doctrine, ſo neceſſarily required to that fayth, wherby a Chriſtian is to be ſaued.

I do heere begin with the *Apoſtles Creed*: firſt becauſe the articles of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Paſſion, are included in the Creed. Secondly, by reaſon there are many *Adiaphoriſts* in Religion (as I may terme them) who ſeeme to deale more largly and liberally heerin; ſeeing they are cõtent to extend the neceſſary *Obiect of Fayth*, not only to the articles of the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Paſſion, but to all points ſet downe in the Creed, who aſſure themſelues, that God exacteth at our hands, the beliefe of no other articles, then are contayned in the Creed.

Now heere aforehand we are to conceaue, that true Fayth reſteth in the true ſenſe & meaning of the words of the Creed which was intended by the Apoſtles, and not in the words themſelues; ſeeing both in the iudgment of all learned Catholikes and Proteſtants, to belieue the words of the Creed

Creed in a ſenſe different from the intended ſenſe of the Apoſtles (and conſequently in a falſe ſenſe) is no better, then not to belieue the Creed at all. And the reaſon herof is, becauſe a falſe conſtruction drawne from the Creed (no leſſe then from the Scripture) is not the word of God, but of man; and cõſequently the ſayd letter of the Creed ſo interpreted, is ſubiect to the ſame cenſure, wherunto the word of man is lyable: from whence it followeth, that whoſoeuer belieueth the words of the Creed in another ſenſe, then was intended by the holy Ghoſt and the Apoſtles, doth not belieue the Creed at all; but only belieueth the word of man, which euer ſtandeth ſubiect to errour and miſtaking. So as, that ſentence of S. Ierome deliuered only of the Scripture, may iuſtly be applyed to the Creed: (a) *Scripturæ non in legendo, ſed in intelligendo conſiſtunt:* Scriptures (or Creed) do not cõſiſt in the letter, but in the ſenſe and true vnderſtanding of the letter.

(a) *In Epiſtola ad Paulinum.*

This then being thus iuſtly preſuppoſed, let vs beginne to examine the articles of the Creed, and ſee, how we Catholikes and Proteſtants do differ in the conſtruction & vnderſtanding therof. And firſt touching the firſt article of our *Beliefe in God*, obſerue how different it is. The Catholikes do belieue,

lieue, that their God no way formally cooperateth or willeth ſinne in man; that he hath but one ſimple and expreſſed will touching Sinne, and this in deteſting or hating of Sinne: that he will not puniſh vs for not keeping of ſuch precepts, the which are not in our power to keepe; that he imputeth ſinnes to euery man that committeth ſinne; briefly that he giueth to all ſufficient grace to ſaue their ſoules, and deſireth that al men may be ſaued. Wheras the Proteſtants belieue the meere contrary to all theſe points: for they belieue, that God (b) cooperateth, forceth, and willeth a man to ſinne: That he hath a double will (and therfore a diſſembling will) the one expreſſed in Scripture, according to which he forbiddeth man to ſinne, the other concealed to himſelfe, by the which he impelleth man to ſin; that he will (d) puniſh vs for tranſgreſſing the ten Commaundements, it not being in our power to keep the ſayd Commaundements; (e) that to the faythfull, ſinning neuer ſo wickedly, no ſinne ſhalbe imputed.

Finally, that to (f) certaine men he giueth not

(b) Beza his diſplay of Popiſh practiſes p. 102. ſaith: God exciteth the wicked will of one thiefe to kill another: ſee *Swinglius tom. 1. de Prouiden. c. 6. fol. 365. Calu. Inſtit. l. 2. c. 18. ſect. 1.*

(d) *D. Reynolds in his 2. Concluſion annexed to his Conference p. 697.*

(e) *Luther tom. 2. Wittenb. de capt. Babilon. fol. 74. D. VVhitaker de Eccl. contra Bellarm. controuerſia 2. quæſt. 5. p. 301.* (f) *Calu. de Inſt. l. 3c. 23.* ſayth: *Conſilio mutuq; &c.* God doth ordaine by his counſaile, that among men ſome be borne to certaine damnation frō their mothers wombe. See Willets Synopſis p. 534. affirming the ſame.

not ſufficient meanes of Saluation, but put-
poſeth and decreeth from all eternity, that
ſome men (lyuing in the eye of the world
& in their owne conſciences neuer ſo ver-
tuouſly) ſhalbe damned, & thrall to ſempi-
ternall perdition. Thus we ſee, how great
a difference there is betweene the Catho-
likes and the Proteſtants, in beleiuing the
firſt article of the Creed. And how neceſ-
ſarily it followeth, that eyther the Catho-
likes or Proteſtants, do ſtand ſubiect and
obnoxious to that ſaying of S. Auguſtin: (g)
Who imagineth God ſuch as God is not, he carieth
euery where another God, a falſe God in his mind.

(g) q. 29. ſup. Ioſue.

Touching the ſecond article, which is
And in Ieſus Chriſt his only Sonne: We (h) Catho-
likes beleiue in Chriſt, who is God of God
and equall to his Father; a Sauiour, who
ſuffred death, *quoad ſufficientiam*, for all man-
kind, and who accomplished the function
of his Sauiourſhip, only according to his
humanity; a Sauiour, who dyed only in bo-
dy and not in ſoule, finally a Sauiour, who
from his firſt conception was endewed
with all knowledge, wiſdome, and prou-
dence, and exempt from all ignorance, paſ-
ſion and perturbation. Wheras diuers chefe
Proteſtants do beleiue in Chriſt, as their Sa-
uiour, who according to their faith, is God
of (i) himſelfe, and (k) inferiour to the Fa-
ther

(h) Concil. Trid.

(i) D. Whitaker approueth this opinion, alleadging Caluin in prooffe ther of, Contra Capinum p. 111.

(k) Melanct. in loc. comm. edit. 1561. p. 41.

ther; who dyed only for the (l) Elect; who performed his mediation, not only according to his humanity, but also according to his diuinity (though in the iudgment of all learned men true Diuinity is impassible) who in the time of his Passion (besides the death of the body, as insufficient for our Saluatiō) suffred in soule the torments (m) of Hell; briefly who laboured with ignorāce, (n) passion, and euen desperation it selfe.

Touching the Article of Christs *descending into Hell*, the Catholikes do belieue thereby, that Christ descended in soule after his Pasion, into that part of Hell, with is called *Limbus Patrum*, to deliuer from thence the soules of the Iust, there detayned till his comming; of which iudgment are also some learned Protestants. But the greatest part of (o) Protestants do interpret this article of Christs descending into his (p) *graue*; so by the word, *Hell*, vnderstanding to his *graue*. But (q) Caluin teacheth, that by Christs descending into Hell, is vnderstood, that Christ apprehended God to be most angry and offended with him for our sinnes; and that thereupon Christ suffered great anxiety and griefe of soule; and which is

(l) So doth D. Willet teach in Synopsi, printed anno 1600. p. 780. as also Caluin and Beza in whole Treatises.

(m) Melancton vbi supra. D. Fulke in his retent. p. 89.

(m) So teacheth Caluin Instit. l. 2. c. 16. sect. 10. & D. Whit. contra Duræum l. 8. p. 556.

(n) So teacheth Beza in resp. ad act Colloq. Montisb. part. 1. p. 147. D.

(o) So D. Bilson in his Suruey of Christs suffring &c. p. 650. 651. 652. The Lutherās are generally the same opinion. (p) D. Willet in his Lymbomastix. D. Fulke

Willet Synop. p. 599. & 600.

ged by D. Willet in Synop. p. 605. 606. (q) l. 2. Instit. c. 16. §. 20.

is more, moſt blaſphemouſly Caluin teacheth, that Chriſt vttered words of deſperation in ſaying: *O God, my God, why haſt thou forſaken me.*

Touching the article of *Chriſts aſcending into Heauen*, we Catholikes and the Caluiniſts do belieue heerby, that Chriſt truly in body aſcended vp into Heauen: whereas all Lutherans(r)do teach, that Chriſts Body is in all places with the diuinity, and that therfore it did not really, after his Paſſion, aſcend vp into Heauen, it being then both before and after his Paſsion. Thus the Lutherans, both in ours, and the Proteſtants iudgments, do deſtroy, by this their conſtruction, the whole Creed, and particulerly Chriſts Incarnation, Natiuity, Paſſion, death, aſcending to Heauen, and his comming to Iudgment; for ſuppoſing Chriſts body to be in all places, all theſe articles were but apparently, or phantaſtically, and not truly and really performed.

Touching the article of *Chriſts iudging the quicke and dead*: We Catholikes do beleiue, that Chriſt at his comming to iudgment will ſo iudge man, as that his good workes, receauing all their force from our Sauiours Paſsiõ, ſhalbe rewarded: wheras the Proteſtants denying all(s) merit of workes (as iniurious and derogatory to his death and Paſ-

(r) *Luther in l. de Sacrament. Cœnæ Domini, tom. 2. fol. 112. where he ſaith: Credimus quòd Chriſtus iuxta humanitatem eſt vbique præſens.* The ſame is taught by Brentius in Apolog. pro Confeſſ. Wittenberg. And finally by all the Lutherans.

(s) *Calu. l. 3. Inſtit. c. 3. §. 2. Bucer. in actis Colloq. Ratiſbon. Beza, Zwinglius and moſt Proteſtãts.*

Paſsion) doe hould, that Chriſt ſhall then reward only a bare and ſpeciall (t) fayth.

(t) *Calu. in Antidoto Conc. Tri. Kemnitius in examen Conc. Trident.* and moſt other Proteſtants.

Concerning the article, *I beleiue in the holy Ghoſt:* Wheras all Catholikes and many Proteſtants, do beleiue, that the holy Ghoſt is the third Perſon in the moſt Bleſſed Trinity; Caluin how euer he was perſuaded of the truth or falſehood therof, much laboureth notwithſtanding to auoyde the force of arguments drawn from the chiefeſt places of ſcripture, and vſually alleadged by al Antiquity, in proofe of the holy Ghoſt being the third Perſon in the Trinity. Thus we find, that Caluin (u) will not haue (cõtrary to all Antiquity) that paſſage of Scripture, Pſal. 33. *By the word of the Lord the Heauens were made, and al the Hoſt of thẽ by the ſpirit of his mouth,* to be vnderſtood of the diuinity of the holy Ghoſt: In like ſort he reiecteth the argumẽt (x) drawn frõ that other moſt remarkable text, Iohn 5. *There be three, that giue teſtimony in Heauen, the Father, the word, & the holy Ghoſt, and theſe three be one*; Caluin vpon this place thus ſaying (heerby to take away frõ thence the proofe of the holy Ghoſt:) *Quòd dicit tres eſſe vnum, ad eſſentiam non refertur, ſed ad conſenſum potiùs.* Finally Luther was ſo far from acknowledging the holy Ghoſt to be the third Perſon in the Trinity, or to confeſſe the Trinity it ſelfe, that thus he writeth: (*) *Anima mea*

(u) *Inſtit. l. 1. c. 13. ſ. 25.*

(x) See of this Subiect againſt the Trinity, Ægidius Hunnius a Proteſtãt, in his booke entituled Caluinus Iudaizãs.

(*) *Luther Confut ration. Lat.*

mea odit hoc verbum Homousion, vel Consubstantialis. My very soule doth hate the word Homousion, or Consubstantiall.

Concerning the article, *I believe the holy Catholike Church:* The Catholikes do believe this Church to be a visible company of men, professing the present Roman Catholike fayth, of which some are predestinated, others reprobated, The Protestants doe believe this Church to cõsist only of the (y) Elect and Predestinate.

(y) *Confess. Augustana Art. 7. Luther. l. de Conc & Eccles. Cal. l. 4. Inst. c. 1. §. 2.*

Touching the Article, the *Communion of Saints:* The Catholikes doe heereby believe such a Communiõ to be betwixt the Saints in Heauen, the Soules in Purgatory, & men vpon earth, that the one part doth help the other with their most auaylable prayers and Intercessions. The Protestants deny all such entercourse of benefits betweene these seuerall parts of the Church of Christ; (z) accounting the Catholikes doctrine heerein, superstitious & sacrilegious.

(z) *Calu. l. 3. Instit. c. 5. §. 6. Centuriatores Cent. 2. l. 2. c. 4. col. 460. Brentius in confes. Wittenberg. c. de Purgatorio.*

Lastly, touching the Article of *forgiuenes of Sinnes*, we Catholikes do believe, that this remission of sinnes, is performed when the soule by a true and inherent Iustice, and by the infused gifts of God enioyeth a renouation of herselfe, and thereby becommeth truly iust in the sight of God. The Protestants disalowing all *inherent Iustice*, doe only acknow-

knowlege an (a) imputatiue Iuſtice or righteouſnes, which cõſiſteth in that the Iuſtice of Chriſt is (as they teach) only imputed vnto ſinners; ſo as we remayne ſtill ſinners, though our ſinne be not imputed vnto vs, through Chriſts Iuſtice. A doctrine iniurious to the moſt meritorious Paſſion, and death of Chriſt.

(a) *Kemnit. in Examen. Concil. Trident. Cal. l. 3. Inſtit. c. 11.*

Thus haue we runne ouer the chiefe articles of the Creed, from whence we collect, that ſeeing (as is aboue demonſtrated) He only belieueth auailably, & truly the Creed, who belieueth it in that ſenſe, in which the Apoſtles did write it; & ſeing there are meere different or rather contrary conſtructions of euery Article, giuen by the Catholikes and the Proteſtants; ſo as if the conſtruction of the Catholiks be true, it followeth neceſſarily that the other of the Proteſtãts be falſe, or contrarywiſe; we may therefore iuſtly conclude, that it is not ſufficient to ſaluation for any one to ſay, that he beliueth the Creed, who belieueth the words of it in general (without reſtrayning them to any peculiar conſtruction giuen eyther by Catholikes or Proteſtants) except he belieue it in that one particuler ſenſe (and none other) which was intended by the holy Ghoſt, when it was firſt framed by the Apoſtles.

Now in this next place, we are to demõſtrate,

ſtrate, that graunting for a tyme, by an *Hypotheſis*, or ſuppoſall, that a man did beliue all the Articles of the Creed in their true ſenſe and conſtruction; yet followeth it not, that this beliefe (though it be moſt neceſſary) were ſufficient for a man, to obtaine his ſaluation hereby; and the reaſon hereof is, becauſe it is moſt certayne, that there are diuers points of Chriſtian Religion houlde neceſſarily to be belieued in iudgment both of Catholikes and Proteſtants (and accordingly are belieued iontly both by Proteſtants and Catholikes) & yet the ſayd points are not contained or expreſſed in the Creed. Among others I will inſiſt in theſe following.

Firſt, *That there are certayne diuine writings infallible authority*, which we commonly call the Scriptures of the old & new Teſtamẽt, of which Teſtaments we find no mention in the Creed, and yet all men are bound vnder payne of damnation, to belieue that there are ſuch writings; ſince otherwaye (abſtracting from the authority of the Church) there were not ſufficient meane left, to belieue that it were a ſinne to breake any of the ten Commaundements, or (which is more) that Chriſt Ieſus was the true Sauiour of the world; for though we read in the Creed, that he ſuffered and died,

yet

yet we read not expreſly there, that he dyed to redeeme man.

2. That *there are ſpiritual Subſtances, which we call Angels*, which now enioy the moſt happy ſight of God; and that many thouſands of them did fall preſently after their Creation, and are become thoſe malignant Spirits, which vſually are tearmed Diuells.

3. That there is any *materiall place of Hel*, where the wicked are tormented, of which we find nothing in the Creed, in the iudgment of the Proteſtants; for though the word, *Hell*, be mentioned in that Article *He deſcended into Hell*; yet by the word, *Hell*, the *graue* is vnderſtood by moſt of the Proteſtants.

4. That the *paynes of the damned ſhalbe for all eternity*, and not for a certayne tyme only.

5. That *Adam did preſently vpon his Creation fall from the grace of God, and thereby tranſferred Originall ſinne vpon all mankind*; ſo as by reaſon of his fall, all men are borne in Originall ſinne.

6. That the *world was once drowned for ſin*: which Inundation is cõmonly called Noës floud.

7. That, *our Sauiour whiles he conuerſed heere vpon earth, did any miracles.*

8. That S. *Iohn Baptiſt was our Sauiours Precurſor, or forerunner*; and that our *Sauiour*

did choose vnto him certayne men for his Apostles, which did first preach, and plant the Christian fayth, throughout the world.

9. That *Circumcision is now forbidden*, as a thing most vnlawfull & vngodly.

10. That there are *any Sacraments of the new Testament*, (as the Sacramēt of Baptisme, or Eucharist) and instituted by Christ for the spirituall good of mans soule.

These points (besides some others) all christians (aswell Protestants as catholiks) do belieue, and do hould that their beliefe of these points is necessary to saluation; & yet not any one of all these Articles is expressed or set downe in the Apostles creed. From whence I would conclude, that the Apostles Creed cannot be a sufficient boundary, to contayne and limit an auayleable fayth: For what hope can that man haue of his saluation, who belieueth, that there are neyther any diuine scriptures, nor Angells, nor Diuells; nor any Decalogue, commonly called the Ten commaundements, nor that Christ did worke any miracles; nor that he dyed for man; nor that he instituted any Sacrament, and particulerly the Sacraments of Baptisme, and the Eucharist; nor finally (to omit the rest) that there is any place of Hell, or any eternity of punishment for the damned?

And

And heere I am to premoniſh the Reader, that it is no ſufficient anſwere to reply, that moſt of all the foreſayd points are expreſſed in the Scripture, and therefore are to be belieued; This (I ſay) auayleth not, ſeeing heere I diſpute againſt thoſe, who maintayne with wonderfull pertinacity of iudgment, that it is ſufficient to ſaluation to belieue only the Articles, (and nothing els) which are contayned in the Creed: but not any of the former Articles are contayned therein. Agayne, ſeing to belieue that there are any diuine ſcriptures, is not expreſſed in the Creed, it conduceth nothing to the anſwering of this our argument, to ſay, that the forementioned articles are proued out of Scripture, and therefore are to be belieued.

Neither ſecondly, can the force of our ſaid argument be auoyded in replying, that all the former articles are virtually and potentially comprehended in that article, *I belieue the holy Church*; becauſe the Church teacheth that all theſe articles are to be belieued. This is no warantable anſwere, by reaſon that, as theſe may be reduced to this Article of the creed, ſo alſo may all other points controuerted between the catholikes and the Proteſtants be in like māner reduced to the ſaid Article; ſeeing the church of God ſetteth downe what is the truth, and what is to be

belieued in the ſayd controuerſies; bynding her children vnder payne of damnation, aſwell to belieue the truth in the controuerſies of our dayes, as to belieue the former mentioned articles, which are not expreſſed in the creed. And yet theſe our *Newtralliſts* in Religion, who make the Creed the ſole ſquare of their Fayth, doe not thinke that thoſe queſtions of Religion inſiſted vpon betweene the Catholikes and the Proteſtants, are in belieuing or not belieuing of them, any way hurtfull to their Saluation.

THE SAME PROVED FROM *the want of vnity in fayth betweene Catholikes and Proteſtants, in Articles neceſſary to be belieued, and yet not expreſſed in the Creed.*

CHAP. V.

IN this third and laſt place, we will inſiſt in certayne controuerſies of Religion, neceſſarily to be belieued (the one way) both in the iudgment of Catholikes and Proteſtants, and not contained in the creed; and yet ſo differently maintayned by Catholikes and Proteſtants, as that graunting the maintayners on the one ſide hould the truth, it followeth, that the other party vphouldeth falſhood and Hereſy. Now for the more daungerous woun-

wounding of our Newtralizing Christians heerein, I will omit heere to speake of the cõtrouersies touching Purgatory, Praying to Saints, Freewill, Monachisme, and diuers other such like, & will restrayne my selfe only to those Controuersies, the subiect of which Controuersies are taught by the one side to be (vnder Christ) the immediate meanes of our grace and Saluation; & denyed by the other party to be of any such force or efficacy for the soules euerlasting good: So as if it be shewed, that the Protestants and the Catholikes doe maynely dissent in the meanes of obtayning grace, and purchasing of saluation, it must of necessity be inferred, that both the Protestants and Catholikes (continuing in such their contrary fayths) cannot attayne grace and saluation: since not only Philosophy, but euen naturall reason teacheth vs, that he neuer shall attayne the end, who vseth eyther not the same meanes, or contrary to those meanes, which are only and necessarily instituted to the gayning of the sayd end.

But to proceed to these points: first, 1.
Concerning the Sacraments in generall; the Catholikes do belieue, that all of them (where no iust impediment is) doe conferre grace into the soule of man; by the help and continuance of which grace, the soule in the

end obtayneth ſaluation: The Proteſtants doe not aſcribe any ſuch ſupernaturall effect or operation of grace to them.

2. And to come more particulerly to the Sacraments: Touching *Baptiſme*, the Catholikes belieue, that Children, as being borne in Originall ſinne, cannot be ſaued, except they be baptized with water, according to (1) *Ioan.* 3. thoſe words of S. (1) Iohn: *Vnleſſe a man be borne againe of water and the ſpirit, he cannot enter into the kingdome of God*. The (2) Proteſtants belieue, that Infants dying vnbaptized, may be ſaued.

(2) Willet in his meditation vpon the 112. Pſalme, and Caluin and Beza moſt frequently.

Touching the *Sacrament of Pennance, or Confeßion:* The Catholikes belieue, that after a Chriſtian hath committed any one mortal ſinne, that ſinne cannot be forgiuen him, but by meanes of cõfeſſing the ſaid ſinne to a Prieſt of the new Teſtament, and receauing abſolution therof from him; anſweareably to that of S. (3) Iohn: *whoſe ſinnes you ſhall forgiue, they are forgiuen them; and whoſe ſinnes you ſhall retayne, they are retayned*. The Proteſtants belieue, that neither the confeſſion of ſinnes to man, nor the abſolution of man is neceſſary for the remitting of ſinne vnto them, but that it is ſuficient to confeſſe them only to God. And thus according to this their diuerſitie of doctrine, either the Proteſtants, for want of this Sacrament,

(1) Ca. 20.

graun-

graunting it to be neceſſary (after he hath once mortally ſinned) cannot be ſaued; or the Catholike for practiſing a falſe & ſuperſtitious manner of ſeeking to haue his ſinnes remitted (ſuppoſing it to be repugnant to the Inſtitution of Chriſt) cannot haue them remitted, and conſequently cannot be ſaued.

Touching *the moſt bleſſed Eucharift*; The Catholikes belieue, that the verie body and bloud doth lye ineffably, and latently vnder the formes of bread and wyne, according to that: (4) *This is my Body, This is my bloud.* That (5) *Vnleſſe we eate his Body and drinke his bloud, we ſhall not haue life euerlaſting:* Laſtly, that we are to *Adore Chriſt his Body*, being accompanied with his Diuinitie in the ſaid Sacrament. The Proteſtants do belieue, that his true Body, as neuer leauing heauen, cannot poſſibly be truly and really vnder the formes of bread and wyne; and conſequently they belieue that the eating of his body and drinking of his bloud, is not neceſſary to Saluation; finally they hould our Adoratiõ of the Sacrament, to be open Idolatry; and tearme Catholikes Idolaters for the adoring of it. And thus the Proteſtants, as not feeding vpon this Celeſtiall foode, ſhall not haue life euerlaſting, if the Catholikes doctrine heerin be true; or els Catholikes, ſuppoſe they ſhould erre, for teaching and practiſing 4.

(4) *Mat.* 26.
(5) *Ioan.* 6.

&iſing Idolatry heerin, ſhould incurre damnation.

5. Touching the *meanes of our Iuſtification:* the Catholikes belieue, that not only faith, but works alſo do iuſtify: The Proteſtants reiect all workes from Iuſtificatiõ, teaching that only fayth doth iuſtifie man: yea they further proceede, affirming, that who *once hath true faithe, is moſt aſſured, and* (a) *certaine of his ſaluation*; whereas the Catholikes, reputing this as meere preſumption, are willing according to the (b) Apoſtle, *to worke their ſaluation with feare and trembling*. To be ſhort the Proteſtants (*) do teach, that a man by thinking himſelf to be Iuſt, is by this meanes become Iuſt; wheras the Catholikes doe hould this doctrine not only to be phantaſticall, but alſo in (c) reaſon moſt abſurd.

(a) *Caluin. in Inſtit. paſsim. Kemnitius in exam. Concilij Trident.*

(b) *Phil. 2.*

(*) *ſo Luther in art. 10. tt. 12. Caluin. in Antidot. Concil. Trident. ſeſſ. 6. Melanthon in locis, tit. de fide.*

(c) *Vide Bellarm. l. 3. de Iuſtificat.*

6. Touching grace, without which man cannot be ſaued: The Catholiks belieue, that God out of the abyſſe and depth of his infinite mercie, offereth to euery Chriſtian ſufficient grace, wherby he may be ſaued, and therfore they doe encourage euery one to endeauour to ſeeke their ſaluation: The (d) Proteſtants teach, that God giueth not this ſufficiencie of grace to euery one, but to certaine men only, and that diuers there are, who, notwithſtanding all their endeauour

(d) This is taught by Caluin and Beza in whole Treatiſes, and by D. Willet in his Synopſis of anno. 1600. p. 589.

to

to beleue truly, and liue vertuously, yet cannot, nor ſhall not be ſaued.

Touching the *Decalogue, or ten Commaundments*: The Catholikes beleiue, that except a Chriſtian doe keep them, he cannot be ſaued, according to that ſaying of our Sauiour: (d) If *thou wilt enter into life, keep the Commaundments*: The (e) Proteſtants do abſolutely teach an impoſſibility of keeping them; And thereupon (f) Luther thus affirmeth: *The ten Commaundements appertaine not to vs.* 7.

(d) *Mat.* 19.

(e) D. Reynolds in his 2. Concluſ. annexed to his Cõference p. 697. D. Willet in his Synopſis p. 564.

(f) *Serm. de Moyſe.*

Laſtly, Touching the *Pope, or Bishop of Rome*, The Catholikes doe belieue, that he is, vnder Chriſt, the ſupreme Paſtour vpon Earth; that who doth not communicate with him in Sacraments and doctrine, not yealding him all due obedience, in ſubiecting their iudgments in matters of faith to his iudgment and ſententionall definitions, ſet downe in a generall Councell, cannot be ſaued: The Proteſtants doe teach, the Biſhop of Rome is that *Antichriſt*, which is decyphered by the (g) Apoſtle, and which is the deſigned enemy of Chriſt; and that whoſoeuer imbraceth his doctrine, or enthralleth (as they write) their aſſents to his Cathedrall decrees in points of Religion, cannot obtayne Saluation.

(g) 2. *Theſ.* 2. & *Apocal.* 13. & 17.

Thus far of theſe points, in which I haue

haue made particuler choyce to inſiſt (omitting ſome others of like nature) becauſe we ſee, that moſt or all of them doe immediatly & principally (as is aboue ſaid) touch the meanes of purchaſing of grace, of remiſſion of our Sinnes, and of obtayning our Saluation, being maintayned for ſuch by the Catholiks; but vtterly denyed and reiected by the Proteſtants. And heere I now vrge two things. Firſt, if theſe former doctrines, as they are belieued by the Catholikes doe immediatly concerne Saluation, & become neceſſary meanes thereof, as inſtituted by Chriſt; then cannot the Proteſtants, as reiecting all ſuch Doctrines and ſuch meanes both in beliefe and practiſe, be ſaued: If by a ſuppoſall, they be not of that nature, but falſe in themſelues, and the contrary doctrines of Proteſtants true, then cannot the Catholikes (as belieuing falſe doctrines immediatly touching mans Saluation, and accordingly practiſing them) be ſaued: from which forked argument, it may demonſtratiuely be inferred, that it is impoſſible that both Catholikes and Proteſtants (the one part belieuing, the other not belieuing the foreſaid doctrines) ſhould both be ſaued.

Secondly I vrge, that a falſe beliefe not only in theſe articles, but alſo in all other Controuerſies betweene the Catholiks and

and Proteſtant, is playne Hereſy: And this becauſe this falſe beliefe is comprehended within the definition of Hereſie, as being in it ſelfe an Election and choyce of a new or falſe doctrine, wilfully maintayned againſt the Church of God; and therfore it followeth, that eyther the Catholikes or Proteſtants, for their perſiſting in this falſe beliefe or Hereſie, & maintayning it againſt Gods Church ſhalbe damned. But here I will ſtay my ſelfe, wading no further in the diſquiſition, and ſearch of the great diſſentions betweene Catholikes and Proteſtants, touching faith and beliefe; only I will reflect a litle vpon the premiſes. And heere it is made moſt euident; firſt, that the Catholikes and Proteſtants do mainly differ in the ſenſe and conſtruction of the Articles of the Creede; and conſequently (ſeing the ſenſe and not the words do make the Creed) that they both do not belieue one and the ſame Creede, but haue to themſelues ſeuerall Creedes; from which point is ſufficiently diſcouered the want of *Vnity* in faith among them both, which *Vnitie* is ſo neceſſarily required to mans ſaluation, as in the precedent chapter is demonſtrated. Secondly, that though by ſuppoſition, they did belieue the Creede, and the true ſenſe therof with an vnanimous conſent; yet it is

pro-

proued, there are diuers other articles not contayned in the Creed, which are indifferently belieued, as neceſſary to ſaluation, both by Catholike and Proteſtant.

Thirdly, ſeing alſo there are ſundry Controuerſies in Religion (as is aboue exemplified) which immediatly concerne ſaluation, being houlden as neceſſary meanes therof by Catholikes, but diſclaymed from, and abãdoned by the Proteſtants, as mayne errours and falſe doctrines; Therfore from all the former premiſes I do auerre, that it is a manifeſt errour to make the Creed the ſole rule of Fayth, and that he who maintaynes, that both the Catholikes and Proteſtants (notwithſtanding their great diſparitie of beliefe and fayth, the one ſide neceſſarily belieuing & maintayning Hereſie) can be ſaued, or enioy one heauen; is wholy depriued of all true iudgement, reaſon, and diſcourſe; and for want thereof may deſeruedly be ranged among them, of whome the pſalmiſt ſpeaketh: (h) *nolite fieri ſicut equus & mulus, quibus non eſt intellectus.*

(h) Pſal. 31.

THE SAME PROVED FROM *the authority and priuiledge of the Church, in not erring in her definitions, and condemnation of Hereſies: and firſt of Councels.*

CHAP. VI.

FROM the inuiolable *vnitie of faith*, we will next deſcend to the priuiledges of Gods true Church: Of which priuiledges I will at this time take only one into my conſideration; that is, that the Church of God is endued with a ſupreme priuiledge and prerogatiue of not erring in her definitions of fayth, or condemnatiõ of hereſie. This point is warranted by innumerable texts of holy Scripture, as where it is ſayd: (1) *Vpon thy wall, ô Hieruſalem, I haue ſet watchmen, all the day and all the night, they ſhall not be ſilent.* But God did not ſet watchmen ouer his Church to teach errour. And agayne, The (a) *Church of God is the pillar and foundation of the truth*: what more perſpicuous? And further, whereas ech man is commaunded to repayre in difficulties & matters of ſmall conſequẽces to the Church; it is threatned by Chriſt himſelfe, that who wil not heare the Church, ſhalbe accompted as an Heathen, or Publican, according to that his commination: *Si Eccleſiam non audierit*, (b) *ſit tibi ſicut Ethnicus & Publicanus*:

(1) *Eſay.* 72.

(a) 2. *Tim.* 3.

(b) *Mat.* 18.

where we find no restriction, but that in all things we are to heare the Church.

Agayne, Christ himselfe speaketh to his Apostles, and in them to the whole Church: (c) *He that heareth you, heareth me*; But if the church could erre, neither would Christ refer vs to the church (especially vnder so great a penalty,) neither by hearing the church could we be iustly sayd to heare Christ. Finally, the Church is so gouerned by Christ as its head or spouse, and by the holy Ghost as its soule, as therefore we find the Apostle thus to write (d) thereof: *God hath made him head* (speaking of Christ) *ouer all the Church, which is his body.* And agayne: (e) *One body and one spirit*; & yet more: *The* (f) *man is the head of the woman, as Christ is head of the Church.* From which texts it followeth, that if the church should erre in its definitiõs or resolutions of fayth and condemnation of Heresy, this erring might well be ascribed to Christ and to the holy Ghost; and consequently it followeth, that the Apostles in making the creed, would haue omitted that Article: *I believe in the Catholike Church.* For why should we be bound to believe the church, if the church could erre?

(c) Luc. 10.

(d) Ephes. 1.

(e) Ephes. 4.

(f) Ephes. 5.

This truth (I meane, that the church of Christ cannot erre in her sententionall decrees) is so illustrious and euident, that Tertulli-

tullian ſpeaking of certaine Heretikes of his tyme, obiecting the erring of the whole church, thus figuratiuely or Ironically writeth: *Age*; *Omnes* (g) *Eccleſia errauerunt, nullam reſpexit ſpiritus Sanctus, vti eam in veritatem deduceret, ad hoc miſſus à Chriſto, ad hoc poſtulatus de Patre, vt eſſet doctor veritatis &c.* That is, *Go to; Belike all the Churches haue erred, and the holy Ghoſt hath regarded no Church, that he might lead it into truth, being ſent for this purpoſe by Chriſt, and to the ſame end begged by Chriſt of the Father, that it might be the teacher of truth.* And S. Auguſtine: *Diſputare* (h) *contra id quod Eccleſia vniuerſa ſentit, inſolentiſſimæ inſaniæ eſt: To diſpute againſt any point maintayned by the whole Church is extreme madnes.* To whoſe iudgment herein, moſt of the more ſober and learned Proteſtants do indiſputably ſubſcribe; ſince diuers of them doe with all feruour & earneſtnes maintayne, that (i) the church of Chriſt cannot erre, and that what ſhe defineth for truth, is moſt true; or what for Hereſy or falſhood, is hereticall, and to be condemned.

(g) *in l. de præſcript. c. 28.*

(h) *Epiſt. 118.*

(i) D. Bancroft in his Sermon printed anno 1588. Fox Act. mon. fol. 464. b. art. 4. The deuines of Geneua in their propoſitions and principles, diſputed &c. p. 141. and diuers others,

This *Baſis*, or foundatiō of the church not erring, being thus firmely layde, we are heereupon to conclude, that what points of Religion the catholike church of Chriſt hath condemned for Hereſies, the ſame are by vs to be reputed for Hereſies (ſince the

churches condemnation or approbation is moſt infallible) and the maintayners of the ſayd Hereſies, for Heretikes; and conſequently that ſuch Heretikes, as departing out of the Church of God, by their houlding of the ſayde Hereticall opinions, cannot be ſaued. Now, becauſe the iudgment of the Church in matters of fayth is diſcouered two wayes; firſt by the ſentence of generall Councells; ſecondly by the frequent atteſtations of the ſayd chiefe Doctours of the Church in euery age, in their particuler wrytings, they not being contradicted therin by any other Orthodoxall Fathers or Doctours of the ſame age: I will therefore diſtributiuely handle both theſe wayes, ſhewing that both in generall by Councels and alſo by the particuler iudgement of the learned Fathers, many opinions, though not touching the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Paſſion, or the expreſſe Articles of the Apoſtles creed, haue byn condemned for playne Hereſies, and the belieuers of them anathematized for Heretikes.

And firſt, to begin with councells, the infallible authority of which euen Chriſt himſelfe hath by his owne wordes often ratifyed; as where he ſayth: *Where* (k) *two or three* (much more where many hundreds of venerable Biſhops) *are gathered togeather*

(k) Mat. 18.

my name, I am in the midst of them: And againe, ſpeaking to the Church, and in it to the aſſembled Doctours and Paſtours thereof: *I am* (l) *with you all dayes, euen to the conſummation of the world*: which councells are euer directed and gouerned by the holy Ghoſt, according to thoſe wordes in the Acts: (*) *Viſum eſt Spiritui Sancto & nobis*; and therefore are worthily receaued and admitted for the ſupremeſt ſentence of Gods church, not only by the auncient (n) Fathers, but euen by the more learned Proteſtants; ſince to omit others, one of the moſt remarkable of them thus writeth: (o) *Synods are an externall Iudiciall meanes to diſcerne errour: and* (p) *the ſureſt meanes to decide doubts.*

(l) *Mat.* 28.

(*) *c.* 15.

(n) *Atha. Ep. ad Epictetum. Auguſt. in Epiſt.* 162. *Greg. Nazian. orat. in Athan. Cyril l. de Trinit. &c.*

(o) D. Bilſon in his perpetual gouernement. p. 370.

(p) *D. Bilſ. vbi ſupra p.* 374.

But to proceed forward, and to beginne with theſe. And firſt with the councell of the Apoſtles; This councell was aſſembled, as we read in S. (1) *Luke*, by reaſon of certayne contentious men, maintayning that the Gentils conuerted to the chriſtian Faith might eate meate offered vp to Idols, bloud, and ſtrangled beaſts, cõtrary to the cuſtome of the Iewes. The Apoſtles being aſſembled, and bearing with the weakenes of the Iewes in the infancy of the church, decreed all prohibition of eating bloud & ſtrangled meates: After which decree once eſtabliſhed, it is certayne, that it had byn a mortall

(1) *Act.* 15.

ſinne immediatly to haue eaten of bloud, & ſtrãgled meates; ſo as before it being a point of indifferency, is now made neceſſary. This appeareth from the text; Firſt from thoſe words: *Certayne going forth from vs, haue troubled you with words, ſubuerting your ſoules.* But men do neyther depart out of the Church by maintayning certaine opinions, nor by their example therin can they ſubuert other mens ſoules, if their doctrine and practice thereof doe ſtill remayne about thinges indifferent. Secondly from that other paſſage: *It hath ſeemed good to the holy Ghoſt and vs, to lay no further burthen vpon you, then theſe neceſſary thinges;* where we find, that the prohibition of ſuch meates is ranged by the Apoſtles, in regard of thoſe tymes, among thoſe thinges which are neceſſary.

Againe, neither would the Apoſtles haue gathered themſelues togeather ſo ſolemnely, neither would they haue aſcribed the decreeing of it to the work of the holy Ghoſt, if the Subiect of the queſtion, and difficulty then diſcuſſed by thẽ, had concerned matter only of Indifferency, after ſuch their decree made. Now from the example of this councell, I doe gather, That if a councell by its owne authority may decree, that the eating of certayne meates (being otherwayes of their owne nature indifferently to be eaten

with-

without sinne) shalbe vnlawfull, and shall repute and hould the impugners thereof for men *departed out of the Church of Christ*; then, *à fortiori*, what doctrine soeuer a councell shall condemne of it owne nature for Heresy, the same is to be reputed by all good christians for Heresy, and the defendours thereof for Heretikes.

Secondly, the councell of *Nice* was celebrated (though principally for the repressing of Arius his Heresy, denying the Diuinity of Christ;) yet withall touching the controuersy of keeping the feast of Easter, as it is apparent out of (q) Eusebius, (r) Athanasius, & (s) Epiphanius. Now this councell pronounceth *Anathema* to al those, who (besides the denying of the Diuinity of Christ) should deny, that the feast of Easter was not to be kept according to the custome of the church; but according to the custome of the Iewes. And these Heretikes were called, *Quartadecimani*, of whom see Tertullian *libro de præscript.* Augustine *Hæresi* 29. And heere we are to vnderstand, that the word, *Anathema*, vsed and pronounced by this councell (which word is also almost euery where vsed in all generall councells) signifyeth as much as, *accursed*: and in this sense we find this word *Anathema*, to be vsed by the Apostle in seuerall (t) places; so as when a councell

(q) *l.* 3. *de vit. Const.*
(r) *in lib. de Synod. Arim. & Seleuciæ.*
(s) *Hæres.* 70. *vel.* *Audianorum.*
(t) *Rom.* 1. *Cor.* 12

cell pronounceth *Anathema* to any, for believing such or such Heresies, or not believing such and such true doctrines, it intendeth to say, that those men so doing are to be accursed, and abandoned from God: But no man is to be accursed or abandoned from God, for believing, or not believing points of Indifferency, but for believing of such Errours, as cannot stand with his Soules saluation.

The third Councell of Carthage (wherat S. Augustine was present) decreed, that the booke of the Machabees, with some other bookes should be acknowledged, as canonicall, and pronounceth *Anathema*, and condemnation to all those, who should not believe them, as canonicall Scripture. From whence it may be concluded, that seeing the booke of the Machabees teacheth Prayer (*) for the dead, that therfore this councell alloweth that doctrine, condemning the contrary doctrine for Heresy.

(*) 2. Macab. c. 1.

The doctrine of the Nouatians, who taught, That there was not power in the church to reconcile men to God, but only by Baptisme (excluding and denying therby the Sacrament of Pennance) was condemned with the brand of *Anathema*, in the councell of Rome, houlden vnder Pope Cornelius, as (x) Eusebius reporteth. At which

(x) lib. 6. hist. c. 33.

which tyme alſo was condemned for Hereſy the errour of Anabaptiſme, as the ſame (y) Euſebius relateth. (y) *l. 7. hiſt. cap. 2.*

The councell of Calcedon condemned the Hereſy of Eutiches, who taught that there was but only one (z) Nature in Chriſt after his Incarnation. In like ſort the firſt councell of Epheſus condemned the hereſy of Neſtorius, teaching two Perſons to be in Chriſt, as appeareth out of (a) Proſper and (b) Socrates. Now touching both theſe laſt Hereſies, we are to vnderſtād, that both Neſtorius & Eutiches did belieue in Chriſt Ieſus our Sauiour, as the Redeemer of the world, yet they were regiſtred and branded for Heretikes only for their pertinacious erring, touching the Perſon and Natures of Chriſt; as now the Proteſtants may be reputed Heretikes, for their aſcribing of Ignorance, Paſſion, and Deſperation to Chriſt. (z) *Vt patet in act. 2. Conc.* (a) *in Chronico.* (b) *l. 7. c. 34.*

The councell of Chalcedon alſo decreed, that vowed Virgins and Monkes could not marry, condemning thoſe with an *Anathema*, and for Heretikes, that ſhould hould and maintayne the Contrary, as is to be ſeene out of the Councell it ſelfe.

The fourth (c) councell of Carthage (wherat S. Auſtine was preſent) pronounced, that the doctrine of prayer and Sacrifice for the dead, was according to the true fayth (c) *Can. 79.*

of Christs Church, and condemned the contrary opinion for Heresie, and the maintainers therof for Heretikes.

The Councell of Constantinople, vnder Pope Vigilius, condemned Origen for his Heresy, in which he taught that the Diuells should in the end be saued; as (d) Zonaras, and (e) Nicephorus relate. Finally the seauenth Synod or Councell of Nice condemned all them for Heretikes, who taught that the Images of Christ & his Saints were to be depriued of all due respect and reuerence, and to be contemned and broken: Of this point, see Paulus (f) Diaconus, and (g) Cedrenus.

(d) *in vita Iustiniani.*
(e) *lib. 17. c. 27.*
(f) *l. 23. Rerum Romanarum.*
(g) *in Cõpendio Historiarum.*

Thus far concerning Councells condemning for Heresies, false opinions touching fayth and Religion; where I haue restrayned my selfe only to those Councels (this last only excepted) which were within the first fiue hundred yeares or little more, because those times are more prized and esteemed, then later tymes. I haue also made choyce to exemplify some of the Controuersies of these dayes condemned in these Councels.

The like course was cõtinued by Councels for condemning & resisting of Innouations and false doctrines, (though not concerning the Trinitie, the Incarnation, or the

Apo-

Apoſtles Creede) in the ſucceeding ages, which I purpoſely omit. But now I heare demaund; Firſt, how can it ſtand with the infallible authoritie of Gods Church, in not erring in matters of faith (of which priuiledge I haue intreated in the beginning of this chapter) if ſo ſhe ſhall define the former Errours for condemned Hereſies, and anathematize & curſe the maintayners of them for wicked Heretikes (though otherwyſe they belieued in the Trinity, Incarnation, Paſſion &c.) if the Doctrines be but only matters of indifferencie, and ſuch as may ſtand with Saluation? Secondly I aske, how both the defenders & impugners of the ſayd Doctrines can be freed from the brand of Hereſie? ſeing the true definition of Hereſy neſſarily agreeth to the Doctrines maintayned by the one ſide; for it is certaine, that either the Catholikes, or Proteſtants doe make choyce of new opinions heerin, and do ſtubbornely maintaine theſe their Innouations againſt Gods Church.

THE

THE SAME PROVED FROM *the Authority of Gods Church, condemning Heresies; manifested by the writinges of particular Fathers.*

CHAP. VII.

NOw to come to the second way of discouering the Churches sentēce in the foresaid points, which, by the particuler iudgment of the Auncient and learned Fathers (who were in their seuerall ages the shining lampes of Gods Church, and whose authorities all succeeding ages are to reuerence) is easily euicted frō Gods holy writtē: for answereably heereto we (b) Ca. 32. read in (h) Deuteronomie: *Remember the old dayes, thinke vpon euery generatiō; aske thy fathers and they will tell thee, thy Elders and they will declare vnto thee.* And the Protestant Confessiō of Bohemia conspireth thereunto saying: (i) In the Harmony of Cōfessions. p. 400. *The Auncient* (i) *Church is the true, and best mistresse of Posteritie, and going before leadeth the way.* Comming then to the Fathers, I will first insist in the particuler Errours (not touching either the Trinity, the Incarnation, or Passion of our Sauiour, or the Articles of the creed, but points seeming of more indifferencie) condemned by them for open and damnable Heresies.

Next

Next, I will set downe diuers of the Fathers sayings and sentences, pronounced of Heresie and Heretiks in generall. But before we come to the condemnation of particuler Heresies, we must conceaue that reason it selfe, and reuerence due to the cheife Doctors & Fathers of the Primitiue Church, must presuppose, that in those times all those opinions were generally acknowledged for damnable Heresies, which are placed in the Catalogue of Heresies, by Ireneus, Hierome, Epiphanius, Philastrius, Augustine, Theodoret, and other approued authours. This by drift of all reason is to be acknowledged for two respects: first, because we cannot finde any Doctor or wyter of the same ages, who contradicted the foresaid Fathers, for placing in their Catalogues, any opinion, for Heresy, which was not Heresy: Secondly, in that the forenamed Fathers and Authours of the Catalogues of Heresies were godly and learned men, and therfore neither would nor durst brand any opinion with the note & marke of Heresie, which the whole church of God did not then take as Heresie.

All this then iustly and truly presupposed, let vs proceed to the particular Heresies so registred for such by some of the foresaid fathers; where (for the fuller conuincing of our

of our *Newtralists* in Religion) my greatest choyce (some few only excepted) shalbe of the controuersies remayning still at this day, betweene the Catholikes and Protestants.

(k) *as Eusebius relateth l. 5. Hist. c. 20.*

1. That *God was the authour of sinne*, was maintayned by Florinus, & condemned for Heresy or rather Blasphemie, by (k) Irenæus, and Vincentius (l) Lyrinensis.

(l) *in suo Commonitorio.*

2. The opinion touching the *Impossibility of the Commaundments*, was maintained by certaine Nouellists of those tymes, and condemned for Heresy by (m) Ierome in these words: *Execramur &c. We do execrate and abhorre the blasphemy of those, who say, that any impossible thing is commaunded by God to be kept, and obserued by man.* See also the like condemnation thereof giuen by (n) Augustine.

(m) *in explanat. Simbol. ad Damasum.*

(n) *de tempore, serm. 101.*

3. That man had not *freewill*, is auerred by the Manichees, and condemned for an explorate Heresy by (o) Ierome, in these words: *Manichæorum est hominum damnare naturam, & liberum auferre arbitrium: The Manichees doe condemne mans nature, & doe take away freewill.* As also by S. (p) Augustine saying: *Peccatorum originem non tribuunt Manichæi libero arbitrio: The Manichees do not ascribe the beginning of sinne to Freewill.*

(o) *in præfat. dial. contra Pelag.*

(p) *l. de hæres. c. 46.*

4. That *Fayth doth only iustify*, was condemned for an Heresy in the Eunomians by

Saint

Saint Auguſtine, (q) who further ſayth, (r) That it firſt proceeded from the falſe vnderſtanding of S. Paul in his Epiſtles.

(q) l. de hæreſ. c. 34.
(r) l. de fide & operibus c. 24.

5. That *Prayer or Sacrifice could not be offered vp for the dead*, is maintayned by Aërius & his followers, who alſo taught, that no ſet faſting-dayes are to be appointed by the church: yet were theſe two opinions condemned for Hereſies by (s) Epiphanius, and Saint (t) Auguſtine, who thus wryteth: *Aëriani Hæretici docent, non oportere orare, aut offerre ſacrificium pro mortuis, nec ſtatuta ſolemniter celebrãda eſſe ieiunia, ſed cùm quiſq; voluerit, ieiunandum, ne videatur eſſe ſub lege.* The Aërian Heretikes doe teach, that we ought not to pray, or offer ſacrifice fo the dead, that ſolemne faſting dayes are not to be celebrated, but that euery one is to faſt, whẽ it pleaſeth him, leaſt otherwayes he might ſeeme to liue vnder the Law. Thus far S. Auguſtine.

(s) hæreſ. 75.
(t) lib. de hæreſ. c. 33.

6. That *Prieſts might marry*, was condemned in Vigilantius for Hereſy, by Ierome, who in his booke againſt Vigilantius thus writeth: *Quid facimus Orientis Eccleſiæ &c. What do the Churches of the Eaſt in this point? what the Church of Egypt, and the Apoſtolicall Sea? they admit for Prieſts, men, who are eyther Virgins, or cõtinent, or if they haue wyues, do ceaſe to become husbands.*

7. That *Marriage and Virginity were of equall dignity*, was defended by Iouinian; who

who also absolutely denyed all diuersity of merits; yet was this his errour condemned for heresy by (u) S. Hierome, and S. (x) Augustine, thus writing heerof: *Iouinianí damnamus errorem, qui dicit nullam in futuro meritorum distantiam: We condemne the errour of Iouinian, who teacheth that there is no disparity or difference of merits in tyme to come.*

(u) lib. 1. aduersus Iouin. c. 2.
(x) de tempore. serm. 191.

8. That the *Church was not euer visible*, was taught by the Donatists, but condemned for a most wicked *Heresy by S. Augustine*, who thus discourseth thereof: *Donatistæ detorquent Scripturas in Ecclesia Dei, vt tanquam defecit & perijsse de toto orbe videatur.* The (x) Donatists do detort the Scripture, and apply it to the Church of God, that the Church thereby may seeme to haue suffered defect, or perished out of the whole world.

(x) lib. de vnit. Eccles. c. 12. & Epist. 170. ad Seuer.

9. That *Baptisme of Children was not necessary*, was taught by the Pelagians, but condemned for a manifest heresy, by (y) Innocentius, by S. Augustine (z), and by S. (a) Leo.

(y) in Rescripto ad Mileuit. Concil.
(z) hæres. 86.
(a) in Ep. 86. ad Epis. Aquileiensem.

10. The *Religious vse of Images of Christ or his Saints*, was sacrilegiously denyed by Xenaias Persa, as (b) Nicephorus witnesseth, writing thus: *Xenaias iste primus (ô audaciam animam, & os impudens!) vocem illam euomuit, Christi & eorum, qui illi placuere, imagines venerandas non esse.* That is this: *Xenaias was the first that vomited forth this word (o bould soule & impu-*

(b) l. 16. c. 27.

dent mouth!) that the Images of Christ and his ſeruants were not to be worshipped.

11. That we ought *not to pray to Saints, or to worship their Relikes*, was iuſtifyed by Vigilantius, but condemned for hereſy by S. Ierome (c) and by S. Auguſtine, who of this latter branch thus wryteth: *Sanctorum* (d) *corporum, & præcipue Beatorum Martyrum Reliquias, ac ſi Chriſti membra, ſinceriſſime honoranda credimus; Si quis contra hanc ſententiam venerit, non Chriſtianus, ſed Eunomianus aut Vigilantianus creditur. We beliene, that the Relikes of holy bodyes (but eſpecially of martyrs) as the members of Christ, are to be honoured moſt ſincerely; and who ſhall come to impugne this doctrine, is to be accompted no Chriſtian, but an Eunomian, or a Vigilantian.*

(c) *Li. contra Vigil. c. 1. & 3.*
(d) *Lib. de Eccleſ. Dog. c. 7.*

12. The *ouerthrowing of Altars, and caſting away of holy Chriſme*, was taught & practiſed by the Donatiſts, yet was this their ſacrilegious proceeding condemned, and themſelues branded for heretikes by S. (e) Auguſtine, and by Optatus, who ſpeaking to the Donatiſts, diſcourſeth thereof in this manner: *Quid* (f) *eſt tam ſacrilegum, quàm altaria Dei (in quibus & vos aliquando obtuliſtis) frangere, radere, remouere? Quid enim eſt Altare, niſi ſedes ſanguinis & corporis Chriſti? Quid vos offenderit Chriſtus, cuius illic per certa momẽta corpus & ſanguis habitabat? What is ſo ſacrilegious (O you Donatiſts)*

(e) *Lib. 2. cont. Petil. c. 52. & l. 3. c. 40. & Epiſt. 163.*
(f) *Lib. 6. contra Donatiſtas.*

natists) as to breake, deface, and cast downe the Altars of God, whereupon your selues haue sometimes offered vp sacrifice? What other thing is an Altar, then the seate of the body and bloud of Christ? In what hath Christ so offended you, whose body & bloud for certaine moments or short times, did dwell or remayne vpon the Altar?

To be short, I passe ouer (as lesse pertinent to the Controuersies of these tymes) how the Errour of Origen touching the *saluation of the Diuells* was condemned for Heresy by (g) S. Augustine; the Errour of Tertullian denying *second marriages* was in like sort mightily reprehended and condemned by the sayd (h) S. Augustine: though both these Doctours (I meane Tertullian and Origen) had otherwaies by their learned wrytings, deserued well of the church of God; and though the Heresies taught by them, might seeme partly to be excused, to wit, the one in the defense of chastity, the other of mercie.

(g) Hæres. 43.

(h) Hæres. 86.

Thus far touching the foresayd controuersies condéned for Heresies by the fathers of the Primitiue church, though the subiect of the sayd Heresies was neyther touching the Trinity, the Incarnation, Passion of our Sauiour, or the Articles of the creed; A point so euident and confessed euen by the Protestants, as that many of the foresaid examples

art

re collected out of the Fathers, and confeſſed ſo to be condemned by diuers learned Proteſtants; as by the Centurifts in their fourth chapter of euery ſeuerall century; by Oſiander in his ſeuerall centuries, as alſo by Pantaleõ in his chronology. Beſides which condemnation of the church, either theſe Doctrines, or the contrary to them, are neceſſarily proued to be Hereſies, euen from the definition of Hereſy aboue ſet downe; and from whence it followeth, that both the catholikes and the Proteſtants (the one belieuing thẽ, the other not belieuing them) cannot be ſaued, ſeeing Heretikes continuing Heretikes cannot be ſaued.

Now, to come to the ſentences of the Fathers, powred out in great heate and feruour of zeale, agaynſt Heretikes and Hereſy in generall. And firſt to beginne with Saint Iohn the Euangeliſt; S. (k) Irenæus relateth to ſet down Irenæus his owne words) that Policarpus the martyr, who was ſcholler to the Apoſtles, was wont to tell, how that S. Iohn (the Apoſtle of our Sauiour) being in a certayne tyme in Epheſus, going into a publike Bath, and finding Cerinthus the Heretike to be within the bath, ran preſently out of the bath, ſaying to them, that were with him; *let vs flie from hence, for feare leſt the bath fall vpõ vs, & kil vs, in which the enemy of God*

(k) *Lib. 3. c. 3. & apud Euſeb. l. 4. c. 14.*

(l) *Vbi ſupra.*

Cerinthus abideth. The ſame Authour (l) Ireneæus in like ſort relateth in theſe words following, how that the foreſayd Policarpus, meeting at Rome by chance Marcion the Heretike, and he demaunding of Policarpe, whether he knew him or not? Policarpe anſwered, *I know thee for the firſt begotten child of Sathan.*

To conclude with the teſtimony of this Father, the ſayd Irenæus wryting to Florinus an Heretike, who once was Scholler to S. Policarpe with him, thus ſayth:

(m) *Iren. Epiſt. ad Florin.*

(m) *Theſe opinions of thine (O Florinus) ſpeake friendly, are not true, nor wholſome. Theſe opinions are repugnant to the Church, &c. I may truly proteſt, that if the holy and Apoſtolicall Prieſt Policarpus had heard of ſuch opinions as thou defendeſt, he would haue ſtopped his eares & eryed out (according to his faſhion) o good God, to what miſerable tymes haſt thou reſerued me, that I heare theſe things! and preſently would haue run forth of the place, where he had byn ſtanding or ſitting, where ſuch doctrine had byn vttered,* Be now to reflect a little vpon the premiſes Cerinthus, Marcion, & Florinus did all believe in the Trinity, the Incarnation of our Sauiour, and receaued the Apoſtles creed and erred only in leſſer points; For if they had erred in denying the Trinity, Incarnation, Paſſion &c. they had not byn reputed

for Heretikes, but rather for Iewes, Pagans, or Infidells, as aboue is noted: and yet we see, what sharp reprehensions were vsed aygnst them by S. Iohn and S. Policarpe his scholler, (*as to flie out of their company: to acknowledge them to be the Children of the Diuell: to stoppe their owne eares for not hearing of their Errours &c.*) all which speaches had byn ouer much aggrauated, and transcended the bond of Charity, if their Errours had rested only vpon matters of Indifferency, and had byn but such, as had byn compatible with mans Saluation.

But to proceed to the sentences of other Fathers in this point, S. Ierome expresly thus writeth: (n) *For one word or two contrary to the fayth, many haue byn cast out of the Church.* Yea he pronounceth and proceedeth further, expresely thus wryting: *Hæretici quicũq;, Christiani non sunt: whosoeuer are Heretikes, those men are not Christians.* Basill was wont to say, as (o) Theodoret recordeth: *Those who are truly instructed in the diuine doctrine, will not suffer any sillable of the diuine decrees to be corrupted, but for the defence (if necessity forceth them) will vndergoe any kind of death.* (p) Tertullian (that Auncient Father) hath a sentence not much differing from that of the former Father (q) S. Augustine: *Imagine a man to be chast, continent, not couetuous, not seruing Idolls, ministring hospitality*

(n) Lib. 3. Apolg. contr. Ruffin.

(o) Lib. 4. hist. c. 17.

(p) Lib. de præscript.

(q) Lib. 4. contra Do- cap. 8.

lity to the poore, enemy to none, maligning no body, ſober, frugall &c. But yet if he be an Heretike, certainly no man doubteth, but for this alone, that he an Heretike, he ſhall not poſſeſſe the Kingdome God. A dreadfull ſaying of ſo learned & godly a Father.

The Donatiſts for diſagreeing from S. Auguſtine in ſome Traditions; not ſpecifyed in the Scripture, (much leſſe in the Creed) are thus reprehēded by him: *In (r) theſe points thoſe Heretikes were with me, in Hereſy not with me; in many thinges with me, in a few not with me; the many could not help thē, in which they were with me.* And yet theſe Donatiſts believed with Saint Auguſtine, the Trinity, the Incarnation, and recited with him the Apoſtles creed.

(r) *Aug. in explan. pſal. 54.*

Briefly S. Auguſtine *in q. 11. in Matt.* thus deſcribeth an Heretike: *Hereticus eſt, qui de aliqua parte doctrinæ Chriſtianæ falſum credit. He is an Heretike, who believeth any falſe thing touching any part of Chriſtian fayth*: within which definition it neceſſarily followeth, that eyther the Proteſtants for not believing Purgatory, Prayer to Saints, freewill, merit of workes &c. or the Catholikes for believing of them are to be included. S. Gregory Nazianzen orat. 37. *Vnum vni coharet &c. One point of fayth agreeth with another, ſo as of them altogether there is made a certayne golden and wholeſome chayne*

chayne; therfore if but one opinion or article be taken away, or made doubtfull, the whole chayne of fayth will become broken. S. (s) Cyprian: *Dominus noster Iesus Christus &c. When our Lord Iesus Christ did testify in the Ghospell, that those were his enemyes, who were not with him, he noted not any one Heresy, but he manifestly sheweth, that all Heretikes whatsoeuer are his enemyes; saying: He that is not with me, is agaynst me, and he that doth not gather with me, disperseth.* S. (t) Chrysostome sayth: *Quemadmodum moneta Regia &c. Euen as, who pareth away a little of the Kings siluer, maketh the whole peece to be adulterate; Etiē so, who ouerthroweth the least branch or part of true Faith, may be sayd to corrupt the whole, he proceeding from these small beginnings to worser courses.*

(s) *Lib. 1. ad Mag.*

(t) *In Epist. ad Galat. c. 1o8*

To come to an end of the Fathers iudgments in this poynt, S. Ambrose shall (u) conclude all, who thus plainly writeth heereof: *Si vnum horum retraxeris &c. If thou shalt recall, or deny any of these points, thou hast retracted thy owne Saluation: for euen Heretikes seeme to challenge Christ to them; for no man will deny the name of Christ: neuertheless he indeed denyeth Christ, who doth not confesse al points of fayth, instituted by Christ.*

(u) *Lib. 6. in Luc. c. 9.*

Thus far of the Fathers iudgments in this matter, where I am to aduertise the Reader; first (as aboue I haue touched in the Councells) that if all false Doctrines what-

ſoeuer pertinaciouſly defended againſt th
church of God be hereſies, as the definitio
of Hereſy aboue explicated, proueth the
to be, and as the Fathers of the Primitiu
church, (and in them the whole church o
God) haue maintayned; then either the Pro-
teſtants, or Catholikes, for their differen
houlding of contrary Doctrines, touchin
Freewill, Purgatory, Prayer to Saints, Sacri-
fice &c. are to be accõpted Heretikes, & cõ-
ſequently both cannot be ſaued in their Re-
ligion. For that Heretikes (continuing He-
retikes) cannot be ſaued, is demonſtrated
firſt, from the fearfull threats and commi-
nations of the Apoſtles, thundred out a-
gainſt Heretikes (of which point I hau
diſcourſed aboue.) Secondly, from the Au-
thority of the church of Chriſt, which ex-
cludeth all Heretikes (as I haue ſhewe
from all hope of ſaluation; and laſtly (t
omit many other reaſons) from that prin-
ciple, that *Heretikes are no members of Chriſt h*
Church, of which point we are to diſpute i
the next place. The Second thinge to be ad-
uertiſed is, that not any of the former au-
thorities of the fathers againſt Hereſy, a
reſtrayned by them to Hereſies touchin
the Trinitie, the Incarnation of Chriſt, h
Paſſion, or the Articles of the creed; ſuppo-
ſing the denyall of them to be hereſies, a
indee

indeed they are not, but rather blaſphemyes & Infidelity, (for of theſe there is made no mention, or intimation in their authorities) within which compaſſe our *Formaliſts* in Religion ſeeke to confine their fayth; but they are implicitely extended by the fathers to all Hereſies whatſoeuer, whether they concerne the ſupreme and fundamentall pointes of Chriſtian Religion, or any other ſecondary, and leſſe principall points of the ſayd Religion.

THE SAME PROVED, FROM that Principle, That neither Heretikes nor Schiſmatiks are members of Chriſts Church.

CHAP. VIII.

IN this laſt place concerning the church, we will ſet downe another Principle of Chriſtian fayth, and after will deduce from thence by way of moſt neceſſary inferẽce, our concluſion here handled. The Principle is this: *That Heretikes houlding any Hereſies whatſoeuer, are no members of the Church of Chriſt:* the deduction is, that *Heretikes therfore cannot be ſaued*; ſince none can be ſaued, but ſuch as are members of Chriſts church. This principle is proued (as aboue is intimated) out of Gods holy worde: as where it is (a) ſayd: (a) 1. Tim. 1.

Certaine

Certaine men made shippewracke touching fayth, that is, they fell out of the ſhippe of the church by forging of Hereſies. And againe (b) *They went out of vs*; that is, as S. Auguſtine expounds it, out of the church, whereof we are. The expoſition of which texts are warranted euen by force of Reaſon: for ſeing the church is an vnited multitude (for it is one kingdome, one people, and one bodye) and this vnion cheifly reſteth in the profeſſion of one fayth; it is repugnant to reaſon, that they ſhould be reputed as members of the body of the church, who haue no coniunction at all in the cheifeſt matter with the body.

(b) 1. Ioan. 2.

If we proceed to the teſtimonie of the Auncient Fathers, we ſhall finde them of an vnanimous iudgment heerein; to wit, that Heretikes are no members of Chriſts church, & therfore cannot be ſaued. And firſt occurreth (c) S. Irenæus, who ſayth, that *Policarpe did conuerte many Heretikes to the Church: therfore it may be concluded*, that thoſe Heretikes before their conuerſion, were not of the church.

(c) Lib. 3. c. 3.

S. (d) Cyprian ſaith: Heretikes, though they *be out of the Church, do challenge to themſelues the authoritie of the Church, after the manner of Apes, who not being men, would be accounted to be men.* The ſame father thus in another

(d) Epiſt. ad Iubaianum.

place

place wryteth: *Cum* (e) *Deo manere non possunt, qui in Ecclesia Dei vnanimes esse noluerunt.* They cannot remayne with God, who dissent in iudgment from the Church of God. And yet more fully in the same place: *Non peruenit ad Christi præmia &c.* He arriueth not to the rewards of Christ, who leaueth the Church of Christ; he is an alien; he is profane; he is an enemie; he shall not haue God for his father, who hath not the Church for his mother.

(e) Lib. de vnitate Ecclesiæ.

S. Ierome: *Qui non à Domino Iesu Christo, sed ab alio* (f) *&c.* Who take their denomination, or name not from our Lord Iesus Christ, but from some other (as the Marcionists, Valentinians, Montanists,) &c. are not the Church of God, but the Synagoge of Antichrist.

(f) In dialogo cõtra Luciferiã.

Finally S. Augustine (for I haue allready dwelled ouer longe in the authoritie of the fathers) pronounceth, that: *Nihil sic formidare debet &c.* (g) A Christian ought to feare nothing so much as to be separated from the body of Christ, which is his Church, and which is one, and Catholike; for if he be separated from the body of Christ, he is not a member of Christ; then is he not strengthened with his spirit. But who hath not the spirit of God, the same man is not of God. Thus far S. Augustine, with whom euen the Protestants do ioyne heerein in iudgment, for D. Doue thus saith: *This proposition, that Heretikes are not to be communicated withall, is vndoubtedly*

(g) tract. 27. in Ioannem.

tedly true. And D. Sutcliffe in his examen p. 9. alleadgeth the Laodicean councell Can. 31. 32. 33. in proofe therof, thus concluding: *The Laodicean Councell doth directly cõdemne Communion with Heretikes, either in Marriage or Prayer.*

This allready alleadged may ſerue to proue, that Heretiques are no members of the Church of Chriſt, and conſequently cannot attaine ſaluation; ſince it is agreed amongſt all learned men, that only the members of the church of Chriſt, can fynd Saluation in Chriſt. Now heere by Heretikes, we cannot vnderſtand thoſe, who deny the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Paſſion &c. ſeeing the denyers of theſe Articles are not Heretikes (as is aboue ſhewed in the definition of Hereſy) but they are either Iewes, Pagans, or Infidels: frõ which it followeth, that the fathers authorityes aboue ſet downe againſt Heretykes, cannot be applyed to the denyers of the Trinity, the Incarnation, &c. but they are to be limited to ſuch Heretyks, who maintayne leſſer errours touching Chriſtian fayth. We will in this place deſcend to Schiſmatiks, who if they be neyther of the church of God, nor can iuſtly expect any ſaluatiõ (during ſuch their ſtate) then *à fortiori*, no Heretike can expect any ſaluation; ſince a ſchiſmatike believing all

articles

articles of Christian fayth, doth only in will diuide himselfe by disobedience in not communicating with the church in Prayers and Sacraments; whereas an Heretike with greater malice (as is aboue sayd) willfully and contumaciously maintaineth in his iudgmēt Errours and false opinions, condemned by the church.

Now that a Schismatike is not a member of Christs church, is first proued from those texts of scripture (aboue in part touched) where the church is called *one fould of sheepe*, Iohn 10. *one Body*, Rom. 12. *one spouse*, and *one Doue*. Cant. 6. But now Schisme, according to its Etymologie, diuideth that which was one, into parts; for *Schisma*, being a greeke word commeth of the verbe, σχίζω, which is *scindere*; therfore as a member being cut from the body, is no longer a part of the body; so a schismatike diuiding himselfe by his owne disobedience from the communion of the church, is no longer a member of the sayd church. This verity, to wit, that Schismatiks are not members of Christs church, is (besides the former proofs) warranted with the authoritie & sentences of the Auncient fathers. And first S. Cyprian thus purposely writeth of Schismatikes: (h) *Qui cum Episcopo non sunt, in Ecclesia non sunt.* *Those who agree not with the Bishop* (meaning the

(h) Lib. 2. Epist. 2. ad Florentium.

the ſupreme Biſhop of Gods church) *are no*
in the Church.

(i) *Lib. de Vnitate Eccleſiæ.*

The ſayd (i) Father moſt elegantly com-
pareth Schiſmatikes, to beames diuided fro
the ſunne, to boughes cut from the tree,
and to Ryuers wholly ſeparated from thei
ſprings.

(k) *Hom. 3. in Epiſt. 2. ad Cor.*

S. Chryſoſtome diſcourſing of Schiſma-
tikes, thus (k) ſayth: *Schiſmatis ſignificatio ſat*
eos arguit &c. The very ſignification of the wo
Schiſme, doth ſufficiently reprehend them, or rath
the verie name of Schiſme is a vehement condem-
nation of them &c. which Father in anothe

(l) *Homil. 13. in Epiſt. ad Epheſ.*

(l) place cõpareth a Schiſmatike to the han
cut from the body, which therupon ceaſet
to be a member; and expreſſely affirmeth
that Schiſmatikes, though they conſent wit
the Church of Chriſt in Doctrine, yet ar
not in Chriſts church, but in *altera Eccleſia*,
meaning in a Church differing from Chriſt
Church.

(m) *In c. 3. ad Titum.*

S. Ierome diſtinguiſhing Schiſme from
Hereſy, thus diſcourſeth: *Inter* (m) *Hæreſim &*
Schiſma hoc intereſſe arbitramur &c. We take thi
to be the difference betweene Hereſy and Schiſm
That Hereſy maintayneth a peruerſe and falſe Do-
ctrine; whereas Schiſme, ab Eccleſia pariter ſepa-
rat, *in like manner ſeparateth a man from th*
Church, in regard of diſſention and diſobedience t
our Biſhops.

S. Au-

S. Augustine thus woundeth a Schisma-
ke: (n) *Hæretici & Schismatici congregationes* (n) *Lib. de*
as Ecclesias vocant &c. Hererikes and Schisma- *fide & sym.*
gs do call their congregations, the Churches. But c. 10.
eretikes do violate their fayth in believing falsely
aching God; whereas Schismatikes, though they
lieue the same points, which we believe, yet throgh
eir disentions, they do not keep fraternall Charity:
herfore we conclude that neyther an Heretike be-
geth to the Catholike Church, because he loueth
t God; nor a Schismatike, because he loueth not
s neighbour.

To conclude, (o) Fulgentius agreeth (o) *Lib de*
ith the former reuerend Fathers, thus say- *fide ad. Pet.*
g: *Firmissimè tene &c. Believe for certayne, and* c. 38. & 39.
ubt not, that not only Pagans, but also Iewes, He-
ikes, & Schismatikes who dye out of the Church,
e to goe into euerlasting fire.

And thus far concerning Schismatikes,
ho because they be not of the Church, cā-
ot obtayne saluation; which point being
ade euident by so many authorityes both
uine & humane; then much more strong-
may we conclude, that Heretikes (as ex-
eding the Schismatiks in prauity and ma-
e, and being excluded with them in like
t out of Christs Church) cannot be sa-
d.

But before I end this Chapter, giue me
ue (*good Reader*) to expatiate a little beyōd
my

my desig ned limits: O then you *Schismatik* heere in our owne Countrey, whose soule are wholly absorpt in earthy and mudd consideratiõs, cast your eyes vpon you owne states, and vse some small introuer sion vpon your selues. You see heere, wh a daungerous censure the Auncient churc of Christ, by the mouths of its chiefe Pasto and Doctours, hath thundred agaynst you It sayth, *you are not of Christs Church*; you *aliens, & straungers thereunto*. It further pro nounceth, that dying in such your state, yo are depriued of all hope of saluation. Goo God! what stupor, and dulnes of youn this! Are you Christians? preferre then Chri before the world. Feare you God more the man? *Giue then to God, what is Gods, and to Ce sar, what is Casars.* Reflect vpon three prin ciples of the Catholike (and therefore you owne) Religion.

The first, that God ordinarily deriue his grace into mans soule by the conduits the Sacraments, and giueth absolution ones sinns particulerly by the Sacrament Pennance and confession, & not otherwi you wilfully depriue your selues of the pa ticipation of the Sacraments, and thereby grace, and of the remission of your sinnes are you not then as dryed branches, void that heauenly iuyce, which giueth lyfe

he ſoule? you want this grace and forgiue-
es of your ſinnes; where then is your hope
f eternall life? remēber the Apoſtles words,
nd be afrayd: *gratia Dei, vita æterna*; and do
ot diſioyne thoſe aſunder, which S. Paul
ath ſo inſeparably vnited.

The ſecond is, The vncertainty of any par-
icular mans ſaluation, which point is able
o ſtryke you dead through feare; and the
ather, ſince it is no ſmall ſigne of a mans fu-
ure damnation, deliberately and wilfully
yeare after yeare) to deuide himſelfe from
Chriſts church, and from all the ſpirituall
nfluences ſtreaming from thence.

The third, That there is a Purgatory, the
aynes whereof, though terminable, yet are
nſupportable. Suppoſe then the beſt, that
, that you finally dye with true Repentāce
nd reconciled to Chriſts church (which
et is not in your owne power, but out of
he maine Ocean of Gods mercy) neuerthe-
eſſe your owne fayth aſſureth you, that you
uſt ſuffer in that place euen inſufferable
orments for your former diſunction; & that
our continuance in diſſembling thus with
od, ſerues but as bellowes the more to
low that dreadfull fire. O how great inte-
eſt then are you to pay in the end, for the
ioying of this your miſpent tyme? If you
e Catholikes (though but in hart) you be-

lieue all heere sayd, and therefore may the more assuredly presage of your owne future misery. Yf you doe not belieue these three points of Catholike Religion, then are you damned no lesse for want of true Fayth in Christ, then otherwise by your vnchaungeable Schismaticall liues, for want of due cōformity to the church of Christ: Therefore I wish you to awake out of that spirituall letargy of the soule, & daily meditate on that of the Apostle: *Corde creditur ad iustitiam, ore fit confessio ad salutem.* (q) *With the hart we belieue vnto iustice, but with the mouth Confession is made vnto saluation.* And lest that dreadfull commination and threate of our Lord and Sauiour preuayle with you heerein: (r) *He that denyeth me before men, shalbe denyed before the Angells of God.* But I will stay myselfe, remembring my vndertaken *Subiect*, and will proceed to the next *Head*.

(q) Rom. 10.

(r) Luke. 12.

THE FORMER TRVTH PROVED *from the consideration of the punishments anciently inflicted vpon Heretikes, by the Church of Christ.*

CHAP. IX.

HAVING in the precedent Chapters shewed the Iudgement of the church of Christ, by way of doctrine & speculation agaynst He-

y and Heretikes in generall; we will in his place insist in relating the *practice* of the sayd church agaynst Heretikes, consisting in the punishments aunciently inflicted vpon Heretikes, by the authority of Gods church; from the consideration wherof we may easily gather, that the church of Christ in those tymes infallibly taught, that Heretikes so living, and dying, could not be saued; seeing it would neuer impose such multiplicity of seuere punishments vpō men, for their houlding of those doctrines, which might stand with the saluation of the belieuers of them. And first we are heere to obserue, that the punishments inflicted vpon offendours by the church, were eyther Ecclesiasticall, or Politicall, & Ciuill.

The first of Ecclesiasticall punishments for Heretikes was *Excommunication*, by the which Heretikes were driuen away from the Sacraments, were depriued of the common suffrages and prayers of the whole church; and finally banished from the community & comfort of the godly and faythfull. This censure of Excommunication of Heretiks is most auncient; seeing that it had it beginning from the first times that counsells began to be celebrated for the extirpation and rooting out of Heresies; & is founded vpon all those places of Scripture in the

foregoing chapters alleadged, agaynſt Hereſy and Heretikes.

Another Eccleſiaſticall cenſure agaynſt Heretikes, is the *depriuing them of all the vſe of ſpirituall power*, and authority, whether it be of order or Iuriſdiction. This kind of power belongeth only to Eccleſiaſticall Perſons or the Cleargy: according heereto, if a Prieſt became an open Heretike, he was commaũded by the church, not to performe the publike lyturgy of the church, & if he did contrary therto he was adiudged by the church, to ſinne mortally. In like ſort a Biſhop, leauing his Fayth and maintayning any one Hereſy, did thereby looſe all his authority of Iuriſdiction, and thereupon during ſuch his ſtate, all his Abſolutiõs, cenſures, puniſhments, and ſentences practiced by him towardes any Perſon, were adiudged by the church of God, to be of no force or validity.

(a) *In 3. p. q. 39. ar. 3.* To which practice of the church (a) Saint Thomas ſubſcribeth in theſe words. *Hæretici non poſſunt abſoluere, nec excommunicare, nec Indulgentias facere, aut aliquid huiuſcemodi; quodſi fecerint, nihil actum eſt.* *Heretikes* (ſpeaking of Cleargy men) *cannot abſolue any one, nor excommunicate, nor giue Indulgences, nor exerciſe any ſuch like point of ſpirituall Iuriſdiction; and if they attempt contrary heereto, they do but practice in vayne.*

Tou-

Touching Politicall or ciuill censures, or punishments, anciently inflicted vpon Heretikes. The first may be, that such men were forbidden to *contract any marriage* with other Religious and faythfull Christians; and such of the faythfull christians as did marry with them, did sinne mortally. This is proued out of the (b) Laodicean Councell (aboue touched) prohibiting all such mariages, also all praying and communicating in Sacraments with Heretiks; of which point I will heerafter intreate more fully. (b) *Can.* 31. 32. 33.

Another punishment was, that Heretiks were wholy restrained by the church, from all practice of their Religion. This appeareth from the actions of *Constantine the Great*, who was so farre from graunting liberty of Religion to the Arians, as that he threatned banishment to all who would not subscribe to the Nicene councell. The same is proued from the like iudgement of Iouinianus, who being elected Emperour by the souldiers, admitted the acceptance thereof with this condition, and not otherwayes; to wit, that all the subiectes of the Empire would promise to keep an entire vnity of christian beliefe & practice. The like iudgment herein is of the Auncient Fathers. And first S. (c) Ambrose (though sollicited therunto by the Emperor *Valentinianus*) would not suffer the (c) *Epist.* 33. *ad Marcell. sororem*

Arians to haue within his Iurisdiction any one Church, for the practice of their Religion, to be allotted for them. (d) S. Chrysostome being mooued by the Emperor of his tyme, to graunt a Church to one Gaynas a Duke, for the practice of his Heresy, with great Christian courage openly withstood the same. (e) S. Leo did much reprehend Anatholius (Bishop of Constantinople) for permitting Heretikes to liue promiscuously with Catholikes. Finally (f) S. Augustine did vehemently persuade one Olympius an Earle, that he would diuulge and put in practice the lawes of the Emperour, made against the Heretikes Donatists (who taught the Inuisibility of the Church) that so through force of the lawes they might not be suffered to make any profession of their Religion.

(d) As appeareth out of Theodor. l. 5. c. 32.

(e) Ep. 76.

(f) Ep. 29.

A third punishment concerneth the books of Heretikes, which the Church of God euer prohibited to be read indifferently of all; but only by such learned men, as were able to refute the Errours and Heresies contained in the sayde books. And hence it is, that we finde, that the fourth Counsell of (g) Carthage admonished the Bishops that *they would reade the bookes of Heretikes, only for necessity*. In like sort the seauenth Counsell prohibited the books of the *Iconoclastes*

(g) Ca. 18.

Heretiks, who did write virulent Treatiſes againſt the Religious vſe of Images. To proceed further; there were diuers other chaſtiſements appointed for Heretiks in the auncient Church, (h) and by the auncient Chriſtian Emperours in their lawes; as *Banishment, a pecuniary* (i) *mulct*, or fine; the *loſſe* (k) *of all their goods*; And laſtly, when the inſolencie of Heretiks did grow inſufferable, *euen death it ſelfe*; which puniſhment of death Valentinian and Marcian (the Emperours) did firſt decree: of which point ſee the iudgment of the Councell (l) of Chalcedon, of (m) Ierome, and laſtly of (n) Auguſtine, who *ex profeſſo* proueth, that Magiſtrates haue power to puniſhe Heretikes, euen which the ſword.

(h) Whereof ſee L. *Ariani ca. de Hæreticis.*
(i) L. *Cunctí, Hæretici.*
(k) L. *Manichæi.*
(l) *Act.* 1.
(m) *In c.* 5. *ad Galat.*
(n) *Li.* 2. *contra literas Petiliani c.* 83.

Thus far touching the puniſhments auncietly appointed by the church of God, againſt Heretiks. Now to apply this to our purpoſe, I do heere wiſh the reader, to take into his conſideration two things: firſt, that here is no mention made in the former authorities, what the Hereſies were, againſt which ſuch ſeuere proceedings were put in execution; neither is there any intimation in them of the deniall of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Paſſion &c. but the ſayd puniſhments were extended to all Heretiks indifferently, and without any limitation

of peculiar Hereſies.

Now that theſe puniſhments were not ordayned for the denyers of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Paſſion &c. is euident for two reaſons: firſt, becauſe (as is often aboue ſayd) the denyers of theſe ſupreme poynts are not Heretykes, but Infidels or Iewes: ſecondly, becauſe the puniſhment of death only (and no inferiour puniſhment aboue mentioned) was appoynted by the church for thoſe, who once were Chriſtians, but after did fall into Infidelity, by denying thoſe ſupreme poynts of Chriſtian fayth.

Secondly, the Reader is to obſerue, that ſeing Heretikes, though not denying the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Paſſion, the Decalogue &c. did vndergoe the fore-ſayd puniſhments; the whole Church of God (with is gouerned with the ſpirit of the holy Ghoſt) would neuer haue inflicted vpon them, erring only in leſſer matters then about the Trinitie, Incarnatiõ, Paſſion &c. ſuch ſeuere and rigorous puniſhments, as are aboue mẽtioned, if ſhe had thought, that the defence of thoſe errours (how ſmall ſoeuer they ſeemed) could haue ſtood with the ſaluatiõ of mans ſoule: ſince otherwaies the church ſhould haue diſcouered her ſelfe to be a moſt cruell Tyrant, and not an Indulgent mother to her Children & members.

TH

THE SAME PROVED FROM *Arguments, drawne from Reaſon.*

CHAP. X.

TO paſſe frō the authority of Gods ſacred word, his holy church, & the Auncient Fathers (the pillars thereof) touching the nature of Hereſy and Heretiks, as alſo touching the vnity and Infallibility of the ſame church, and the perſons diſincorporated & ſeparated from it; from all which heads it hath been euidently euicted, that a man obſtinatly defending any one Errour in faith and Religion, cannot expect ſaluation; It now remaynes, that the ſame be made euident euen by force of reaſon, that therby all men enioying the faculty of reaſon, may the more eaſily ſubſcribe to ſo vndeniable a veritie, & ſay with the Pſalmiſt heerin: (i) *Teſtimonia tua credibilia facta ſunt nimis.* (i) Pſa. 92.

Well then, the firſt and cheifeſt reaſon is taken from the cauſes of true fayth, where for the better conceauing thereof, we are to vnderſtand, that fayth is a ſupernaturall habit, not obtayned by the force of nature. Therfore to the beliefe of any one Article or point of fayth two things concurre: the one is the firſt *reuealing Verity* (as Scholemen

men ſpeake) which is God Himſelfe: the ſecõd is the *Church* propounding the article to be believed. Now when we believe any point of fayth, God, who is the firſt reuealing Veritie (as is ſayd) reuealeth it to the church, and the church propounds it, ſo reuealed to vs, to be believed. And thus we believe a point of fayth, through the authority of God reuealing, & the church propounding; and where we believe any thing, though it be true, & not through this authority, this is not ſupernaturall beliefe in vs, but only an opinion grounded vpon other reaſons & inducements: Euen as the Turke believeth, that there is a God, Creator of the worlde, yet this his beliefe is no true fayth, but only a meere opinion of a thing which is true; ſince this his beliefe is grounded not vpon Gods authority reuealing this, but only vpon his *Alcaron*, being otherwayes a fabulous booke, though of the being of one God it ſpeaketh truly.

Now to apply this. This firſt reuealing Verity, which is God, (through whoſe authority we ought to believe euery article) doth with one & the like authoritie reueale all Articles of Chriſtian Religion to the church; ſo as it is as forcibly reuealed to be believed that there is (for example) a Purgatory, or that we ought to pray to Saints,

(graun-

(graunting theſe articles to be true) as that there is a Trinity, or that Chriſt was Incarnate; from whence it vnauoydably followeth, that who belieueth in the Trinity, and yet doth not belieue, that there is a Purgatory, or that we may pray to Saints, hath no true and ſupernatural beliefe of the Trinity; but only belieueth that there is a Trinity, becauſe he ſo vnderſtandeth, or is perſuaded thereto only by his owne reaſon, or through ſome other humane motiues, according to that ſentence of S. Auguſtine *lib. de vtilitate credendi cap.* 11. *Quod intelligimus aliquid, rationi debemus; quod autem credimus, authoritati.* For if he did belieue, that there is a Trinity, or that Chriſt was Incarnate, through Gods authority ſo reuealing this truth to be belieued, by the ſame authority he would haue belieued that there is a Purgatory, or that we ought to pray to Saints; ſeing both the Articles of the Trinity, and Purgatory, or praying to Saints are equally & indifferently a like propounded by God and his Church to be belieued. Thus we may demonſtratiuely conclude, that what Proteſtãt doth belieue in the Trinity, and yet doth not belieue that there is a Purgatory, praying to Saints, Freewill, the Reall preſence (admitting them once to be true) or any other point controuerted betweene

weene Catholikes and Protestants, the same man hath no true fayth at all of the Trinity or Incarnation, and consequently for want of a true and supernaturall fayth, cannot be saued; since we read (a) *Qui non credit, condemnabitur. Who beleueth not, shalbe condemned.* And from this former ground it proceedeth; that (b) S. Thomas, & all other learned Schoolemen teach, that who beleueth not only for Gods authority, so reuealing any point whatsoeuer, great or small, fundamentall or not fundamentall, the same man beleueth not any other Article at all, with a true and supernaturall fayth: and heereto accord those wordes of (c) Tertullian against Valentinus the Heretike: *Some things of the law and Prophets Valentinus approueth, some things he disalloweth; That is, he disalloweth all, whilest he disproueth some.* Which sentence of Tertullian must of necessity be true; since who reiecteth the authority of God in not beleeuing any one article propounded by God to be beleeued, the same man begetteth a suspition or doubt of Gods authority, for the beleeuing of any other article, how fundamentall soeuer.

(a) Marc. 16.

(b) 2. 2. q. 5. ar. 3.

(c) Lib. de præscript.

Another reason may be taken from a distinction of fayth, which according to the learned is of two sortes; The one they call *explicite fayth*, the other *implicite*. *Explicite fayth* is

is that, which all men vnder payne of damnation are bound to belieue; As, according to moſt of the Schoolemen, the Trinity, the Incarnation of our Sauiour, his Paſſion, the Decalogue or ten Commaundements, the articles of the Creed. *Implicite* fayth compreheendeth all thoſe points, which euery vnlearned man is not bound expreſſely & diſtinctly to belieue and knowe in particuler (though he be expreſſely bound not to belieue any thing contrary thereto) but is to reſt in the iudgment of the church concerning all ſuch points; and what the church of Chriſt houldeth therein, he is bounde implicitely to belieue. This diſtinction is warranted not only in the iudgment of all Catholike Schoolemen, but alſo of the moſt learned (d) Proteſtants, though they commonly forbeare the phraſe of *explicite & implicite fayth*; & particulerly of D. Feild, who in theſe words following, giueth the reaſon thereof, ſaying: *For (e) ſeeing the Controuerſies of Religion in our time are growne in number ſo many, and in nature ſo intricate, that few haue time and leſure, fewer ſtrength of vnderſtanding to examine them, what remayneth for men deſirous of ſatisfaction in things of ſuch conſequẽce, but diligently ſearch out which amongſt all the Societies of men in the worlde, is that bleſſed Company of holy ones; that houſehould of fayth, that ſpouſe of Chriſt, and Church*

(d) *D. Bar. l. de fide & eius ortu. p 40. Hooker in his Eccleſiaſtic policy in the preface p. 28. by Melanction l. 1. Epiſt. Epiſt. ad Regẽ Angliæ.*

(e) In his Treatiſe of the Church in his Epiſt. Dedicat. to the L. Arch-Biſhop.

Church of the lyuing God, which is the Pillar and ground of truth, that so they may imbrace her communion, follow her directions, & rest in her iudgements? Thus D. Feild.

Now this distinction being presuppoſed, I thus argue: Both theſe kinds of fayth are neceſſary to ſaluation: *Explicite fayth*, becauſe it comprehendeth all thoſe fundamētall and ſupreme points of Chriſtian Religion, without which, and the expreſſe and articulate beliefe of which, a man cannot be ſaued: And theſe be thoſe only, which our Newtralliſts in Religion hold neceſſary to be belieued: *Implicite fayth* of other points alſo is neceſſary to ſaluation, becauſe otherwyſe then belieuing implicitely & inuoluedly what the church teacheth therein, we cannot (according to the former Doctours words) range our *ſelues to the bleſſed company of holy ones, the houſehould of fayth, the ſpouſe of Chriſt, and Church of the lyuing God.* Againe, ſeing *Implicite fayth* is neceſſary to ſaluation, we muſt graunt, that this Implicite fayth hath ſome *Obiect*; This *Obiect* is not the Articles of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Decalogue &c. (according to the foreſaid iudgment of the Schoolemen) ſince theſe are the obiects of *explicite fayth* (as is aboue mentioned,) therfore Articles of ſeeming leſſer importance are the obiect of *implicite fayth*; the

which

which articles as a man is bound implicitely to belieue in the fayth of the church; ſo he is bound expreſſely not to belieue any thing contrary to the ſayd articles. Seing then diuers Controuerſies betwene the Catholikes & the Proteſtants are included vnder this implicite fayth, and that the church of God houldeth of them but one way; It manifeſtly followeth, that the contrary belieuers of thoſe points doe erre in their beliefe, and conſequently for want of this true *implicite* and neceſſary Fayth, cannot be ſaued.

3. A third reaſon may be this; It is proper and peculiar to vertues infuſed (& ſuch be Fayth, Hope, & Charity) that euery ſuch vertue is wholy extinguiſhed by any one act contrary to the ſaid vertue. Thus (for example) one mortall ſinne taketh away all charity and grace, according to that, (f) *He that offendeth in one, is made guilty of all.* One act of Deſpayre deſtroyeth the whole vertue of Hope; then by the ſame reaſon one Hereſy wholy corrupteth & extinguiſheth all true fayth: Therefore ſeeing Fayth is a Theological and infuſed Vertue, this fayth is deſtroyed with one act of Hereſy, whether it be about Purgatory, Prayer to Saints, Freewil, or any other Controuerſy between the Catholiks & the Proteſtats: Therfore whoſoeuer

(f) Matth. 2.

ſoeuer denyeth Purgatory, or any of the reſt (graunting their doctrines to be true) is depriued of all infuſed fayth touching any articles of Chriſtian Religion; whether they concerne the Trinity, or the Incarnation, or any other fundamentall point, which he may ſeeme to belieue: *But without* (f) *Fayth* that is, without true, infuſed, and Theologicall Fayth) *it is impoſsible to pleaſe God*, as the Apoſtle aſſureth vs.

(f) Hebr. 11.

4. A fourth reaſon ſhalbe this, It is moſt certaine, that what generall propenſion nature (or rather God himſelfe by nature, as by his inſtrument) hath engrafted in all men, the ſame is in it ſelfe moſt true, certayne, and warrantable. As for example, Nature hath implanted in each mans ſoule, a ſecret remorſe of conſcience for ſinnes & tranſgreſſions committed, as alſo a feare of future puniſhment to be inflicted for the ſayd ſinnes perpetrated: therefore from hence it may infallibly be concluded, that ſinne it ſelfe is to be auoyded, and that after this life there is a retribution of puniſhment for our offences acted in this world: ſince otherwiſe it would follow, God ſhould inſert in mans ſoule (idlely, vainely, and as directed to no end) certayne naturall impreſſions and inſtincts which to affirme were moſt derogatory to his diuine Wiſdome, and repugnant

to

to that aunciently receaued Axiome: *God & Nature worketh nothing in vayne.*

Now to apply this; we find both by hiſtory and by experience, that diuers zealous & feruent Profeſſours of al Religions whatſoeuer (both true and falſe) haue bin moſt ready to expoſe their liues in defence of any impugned part, or branch of their Religion. From which vndaunted reſolution of theirs we certainly collect, that this their conſtant determination of defending the leaſt point of their Religion, proceedeth from a genetal inſtinct of God, impreſſed in mans ſoule, teaching each man, that death it ſelfe is rather to be ſuffered, then we are to deny any part of our Fayth and Religion. And thus according heereto we find, that euen the Athenians, who were Heathens (though they did err touching the particuler *Obiect* heerin, as worſhipping falſe Gods) were moſt cautelous, that no one point ſhould be infringed or violated, touching the worſhip of their Gods. The like Religious ſeuerity was practized by the Iewes, as Ioſephus witneſſeth. And God himſelfe euen in his owne written word, threatneth, that (g) *Whoſoeuer ſhall eyther adde, or diminish to the booke of the Apocalyps, written by the Euangeliſt, from him he will take away his part out of the booke of life.* Now if ſuch daunger be threatned for adding to,

(g) Apoc. 22.

or taking from, more or leſſe, then was ſet downe by the Euangeliſt in this one booke, how can then both the Catholiks and Proteſtants haue their names written in the booke of life? Since it is certayne & graunted on all ſides, that eyther the Catholike addeth more to the fayth of Chriſt, then was by him inſtituted, or the Proteſtant taketh from the ſayd fayth diuers Articles, which Chriſt and his Apoſtles did teach. But to returne to our former reaſon. From all this we deduce, that no points of true Chriſtian Religion are of ſuch cold Indifferécy, as that they are not much to be regarded, or that they may be maintayned contrary waies by contrary ſpirits, without any daunger to mans Saluation; but that they are of that nature, worth, and dignity, as man is to vndergoe all kind of torments, (yea death it ſelfe) before he yield, or ſuffer the leaſt relapſe in denying any of the ſayd verityes.

5. The fift and laſt reaſon, to proue that the maintayning of falſe doctrines, now queſtioned betweene the Chriſtians of theſe tymes, are moſt preiudiciall, and hurtfull to the obtaining of our Heauenly bliſſe, wherin at this tyme I will inſiſt, may be taken from the conſideration of the different effects, which the contrary doctrines particularly betweene the Proteſtants and Catho-

likes produce in mens ſoules, touching the exerciſing of vertue or vice: Since moſt vndoubted it is, that the belieuing of ſuch opinions, which of their owne nature do impell, and (as it were) violently draw the ſoule to vice, looſenes, and impurity of manners and conuerſation, cannot ſtand (conſidering Gods infinite hate to ſinne and ſinners) with the hope of eternall happynes. And the chiefe reaſon hereof (beſides others) is this: In that the *Will* (which is the ſeate of vertue or vice) doth neceſſarily & irreſiſtably worke, as the *Vnderſtanding* (in which reſideth Fayth, & all falſe doctrine) doth dictate to the *Will*. Now then the *Vnderſtanding* being infected with Hereſies, tending directly to the planting of vice, and eradicating of all vertue in the ſoule, it of neceſſity followeth, that the *Will* muſt worke and exerciſe it ſelfe according to thoſe falſe principles, which the *Vnderſtanding* ſuggeſteth to the *will* for true; & this with the greater facility in regard of the proneſſe of mans nature (throgh our firſt Parents fall) enclined to liberty, pleaſure, and ſenſuality. But becauſe the ſubiect of this reaſon is a large field to walke in, and the truth therof is to appeare by ſeuerall inſtances, drawne from diuers particuler doctrines maintayned at this preſent by the Proteſtants, and all breathing nothing but

vice, diſſolution, and all turpitude in manners; therefore I will reſerue the enſuing Chapter, for the fuller manifeſtation of the truth in this point.

THE SAME PROVED, FROM *the different effects of Vertue and Vice, which Catholike and Proteſtant Religion doe cauſe in their Profeſſours.*

CHAP. XI.

THE firſt doctrine of this Nature wherein we will inſiſt, mantayned by the Proteſtants, & denyed by the Catholikes, is the *Impoſſibility of keeping Gods commaundements*, according heerto (a) Luther ſayth: *The ten commaundements appertayne not to Chriſtians:* with whom Fox conſpireth in (b) theſe words: *The Commaundements were giuen not to doe them, but to know our damnation, and to call for mercy to God.* Doctor Willet alſo ſaying: *The (c) law remayneth ſtill impoſſible to be kept by vs, through the weakenes of our flesh: neyther doth God giue vs ability to keep it, but Chriſt hath fulfilled it for vs.* And finally Doctour Whitaker in that his ſentence (d): *Qui credunt, ij non ſunt ſub lege ſed ſub gratia. Quid plura? Chriſtiani exemptione legis liberantur. They, who believe, are*

(a) *Ser. de Moyſe.*
(b) *Act. mon. p. 1335.*
(c) *In Sinop. Papiſmi p. 564.*
(d) *Contra Camp. rat. 8.*

vnder the law, but vnder grace. What more in this point is to be ſayed? Chriſtians are freed from the curſe of the law. Now then, if Chriſtians be freed from the curſe of the law (wherin the ten Commaundments are contayned) how can the breach of them be any way hurtfull to the violators of them? And if the Commandments were neither giuen vs to keep, nor we haue power to keep them, to what end ſhould any man endeauour to keep thē? Why ſhould the Thiefe forbeare to ſteale, or the Homicide to commit murther? who ſeeth not how this doctrine diſcourageth a man from liuing vertuouſly, by bridling his vnruly and ſenſuall deſires?

2. Touching *Chaſtity*: The Proteſtants do teach, that Chaſtity is not in our power: And hence it is, that Luther thus wryteth: *It is (e) not in our power to be without a woman &c. It is not in our power, that it ſhould be ſtayed or omitted, but it is as neceſſary, as to eate, drinke, purge, make cleane the noſe &c.* To whom (omitting all others for greater breuity) M. Perkins ſubſcribeth ſaying: *The vow of (f) Cōtinēcy is not in the power of him that voweth.* Now this doctrine being imbraced for true, how forcibly doth it inuite (or rather impell) all people vnmaryed (both men or women) to ſatisfy their luſt, by their owne incontinent liues? In like ſort, what great encouragemēt

(e) Tom. 5. Wittenb. ſer. de matrimonio.

(f) In his reformed Catholike pag. 161.

doth it giue to maryed persons to violate the bond of matrimony, when either of the persons, through absence or long sickenes, or some other suddayne and accidentall impotency, cannot render the act and due of matrimony? And the partyes thus sinning (eyther maryed or vnmaryed) being expostulated and charged with their offence therein, may they not iustly reply in excuse of themselues, that they are not to be blamed or rebuked for their incontinency, seing by their owne doctrine and Religion they are expresly taught, that they haue not the gift of chastity, and that it is not in their powe to liue chastly, & continently?

3. The Protestants doctrine of *Venial and Mortall sinne*, doth wonderfully extenuate, and lessen the atrocity and malice of sinne, in the belieuers of that doctrine. For the Protestants do teach, that there is no such difference of sinnes in themselues, but that the most grieuous sinnes whatsoeuer being perpetrated, and committed by any one that hath true fayth, are but veniall; & their reason heereof is, because in their doctrine no sinnes are imputed to those, who haue true fayth. Thus accordingly D. Whitaker teacheth: (g) *Si quis actum fidei habet, peccata non nocent. Sinne is not hurtfull to him, who actually belieueth:* who did learne this of his gre

(g) De Eccles. cont. Bellarm. Controuer. 8. q. 5. p. 301.

great mayster Luther, thus writing of this point: (h) *No worke is disallowed of God, vnles the authour therof be disallowed before.* All which being graunted as true doctrine, it must needs follow, that who shall take himselfe to be one of the Faythfull (as euery Protestant is bound by his owne Religion to belieue of himselfe) shall make small accompt of committing any sinne; considering he is taught by the former doctrine to belieue, that (to vse the words of one of their owne maysters) (i) *Sinne is pardoned him, as soone as it is committed.*

(h) Luther in his sermons Englished & printed 1578. pag. 176.

(i) Wotton in his answere to the late Popish Articles pag. 91.

4. The Protestants doctrine of *Reprobation and denyall of Freewill*, mightily disanimateth and discourageth the belieuers therof, from imbracing of vertue and eschewing of sinne; for if it be true (as this their Doctrine suggesteth) that some men are borne euen from their mothers wombe Reprobats and thrall to damnation, and cannot be saued; to what end should they seeke their owne saluation by a true Fayth, auoyding of sinne, and practizing of a penitentiall & vertuous lyfe? Or if we haue not Freewill, with the concurrence of Gods grace to do well (as the former doctrine instructeth) why should we giue our best endeauours to imbrace vertue and fly all vice? Since it is not in our power (according to the Protestants

ſtants fayth) to exerciſe the one, and fly the other.

5. To this may be adioyned the Proteſtãts *like doctrine of Predeſtination*, and their ſuppoſed certainty of Saluation. For admit, that men be Predeſtinated without any reſpect or reference to their works and lyues, and that do what wickednes they can imagine, yet certaine it is, that they ſhalbe ſaued; is not this Doctrine moſt potent and forcible to diſwade all the belieuers therof, from exerciſing an auſtere, pious, and Religions lyfe, and to engulfe them eaſily in all kind of enormities and ſinnes? and the rather, conſidering how precipitious & headlong mans nature is to ſinne, & to decline all rigorous and exemplar courſes of vertue; eſpecially ſo the caſe ſtands, that man can neither aduantage or hurt himſelfe, by any ſuch diffrent maner of lyfe. Now, that by the Proteſtants Doctrine no ſinne can endaunger the Predeſtinate, in regard of their certainty of Saluatiõ, appeareth, ſeeing according heerto we find D. Fulke thus to ſay of Dauids adultery: (k) *Dauid when he committed adultery, was and remained the child of God.* And Beza himſelfe to the like purpoſe thus wryteth therof: (l) *Dauid by his adultery and murther did not looſe the holy Ghoſt.* So powerfully do these their poſitions incline men to ſatisfye their

(k) In his tower diſput. with Edm. Campian the 8. dayes cõference.

(l) *In Reſponſ. ad Colloq. Montisbel. part. altera* P. 71.

desires in all vice, impiety, and sensuality.

6. Touching the Protestants *Doctrine of Iustification by Fayth only*, which potentially includes diuers of the other points heere set downe, and which position of it owne nature excludeth from Iustification all works (how vertuous and pious soeuer,) we find the Protestants thus to say. And first Luther speaking heereof, bursteth forth with wonderfull rashnes saying: (*) *Fides nisi sit sine* &c *Vnlesse fayth be without the least Good workes, it doth not iustify, nay it is not fayth.* That Iustification by fayth only extinguisheth all exercise of vertue, is iustifyed not only by experience of these dayes, but also by the acknowledgmēt euen of some learned Protestants: for thus Iacobus Andræas (a famous Protestant) complayning and disliking this Doctrine, writeth: (m) *A serious and Christian discipline is censured with vs, as a new Papacy, & a monachisme: they say we haue now learned to be saued by only fayth in Christ, and we cannot satisfy by our fasting and prayer, and therfore permit that we may giue ouer these, seeing we may be saued otherwyse by the only grace of God.*

(*) Tom. 1. prop. 3.

(m) Conc. 4. in c. 21. Lucæ.

And to the end (sayth this Authour further) *that all the world may knowe, they be no Papists, nor trust in good workes, they take course to put none in practice.* With whose true iudgment heerin M. Stubbs (an English Protestant)

seemeth to consspire, saying: (n) *The Protestant trusteth to be saued by a bare and naked fayth (deceauing himselfe) without good works, & therefore either careth not for them, or at least setteth little by them.* And thus much touching good works, wholly exiled, and banished by the Doctrine of Iustification by fayth only.

(n) In his Motiues to good works. printed 1566. p. 42.

Now that this Doctrine of Iustification by only fayth doth incorporate (as it were) within it selfe, and admit all kind of sinne, appeareth no lesse, by the frequent acknowledgments of the most learned Protestants. And first, Luther thus wryteth thereof: (o) *A Christian baptized is so riche, that although he would, he cannot loose his saluation, by any sinne how great soeuer, vnlesse he will not beleiue.* And Luther in another place: (q) *As nothing iustifyeth, but beliefe; so nothing sinneth, but vnbeliefe.*

(o) Tom. 2. Wittenb. de capt. Babilon. fol. 74.

(q) Luther in loc. com. class. 3. c. 27.

To which Doctrine D. Whtaker (as aboue is shewed) accordeth saying: (r) *Sinnes are not hurtfull to him that beleiueth*: And thus much now touching the Doctrine of Iustification by fayth, where we see, euen by the confession of the Protestants, that this Doctrine preuayleth in the professours thereof no lesse for the committing of all sinne and iniquity; then for the expelling and banishing of all good works, vertue, and deuotion.

(r) Vbi supra.

7. Touching the Protestants particuler

Doctri-

Doctrines of *Fasting*, *voluntary Pouerty*, and *chastity or Virginity*, the three steps of Iacobs ladder, by the which a vertuous soule ascendeth to Heauen: And first of *fasting*, Perkins teacheth thus; (s) *fasting in it selfe, is but a thing indifferent, as is eating and drinking*: with whome cõspireth D. Willet in more full tearnes saying: (t) *Neither is God better worshipped by eating, or not eating. Voluntary pouertie* is so debased by the Protestants Doctrine, as that the foresaid Willet thus teacheth thereof: (u) *It is an enemy to the glory of God, who chaungeth his rich estate, wherin he may serue God for a poore*: So contrary he is to the iudgement of our Sauiour saying: (x) *If thou wilt be perfect, goe sell thy substance, & giue to the poore, and thou shalt haue a treasure in Heauen.*

(s) In his Reformed Catholike p. 220.
(t) *In Synops. pag.* 243.
(u) *In Synops. pag.* 245.
(x) *Mat.* 19.

Lastly, touching *single lyfe* in comparison of Marriage, Luther thus sayth: (y) *We conclude, that Marriage is as gould, and spirituall or single lyfe as dung*. And D. Whitaker, likewyse teacheth thereof in this maner saying: (z) *Virginity is not simply good, but after a certaine maner: it is neuer better then Mariage, but in regard of the circumstance, that is, of the troubles accõpanying Mariage*. Now, I heere demaund with what encouragement can any man goe about to practice these foresayd vertues of *fasting, voluntary pouerty, and perpetuall virginity*, if he be firmely and inwardly persuaded,

(y) *Tom. 5. Wittenb. in exeg. ad c. 7. 1. Cor. fol.* 107.
(z) *Contra Camp. rat.* 8.

ded, that the Protestants former positions & Doctrines, touching the sayd vertues, be true, and agreable to Christs sacred Institutions.

8. But to hasten to an end in this matter, I will conclude with the Protestant Doctrines *touching Purgatory, and Confession of Sinnes*. And as concerning *confession of Sinne* it is found by experience, that (besides the first Institution therof by (a) Christ) a man is much debarred from sinninge, through the shame that he is to endure by confessing his most secret sinnes to a Preist; as on the contrary, it much enbouldeneth one to sinne, if he be persuaded by his owne Religion, that confession of them alone to God is sufficient.

(a) *Mat. 18. & Ioan. 20.*

Touching the Doctrine of *Purgatory*: How doth the denyall of this Doctrine open the sluce to all liberty and iniustice! Since by the Protestants teaching, that no temporal punishment remayneth for sinne once remitted, it taketh away all restitution of things wrongfully detayned, all satisfaction for committing of former sinnes, and finally all mortification of body and soule; and to conclude it freeth a man of all feare of suffering any punishment after this lyfe; and this vnder colour, that Christ hath satisfyed for the sinnes of all the world; by

which

which reason we might take away prayer, for that Christ prayed for all in the garden.

But now to cast our eye backe vpon the foresayd Doctrines. If all the different opinions of fayth, in Controuersie betwene the Catholiks & the Protestants, were meerely speculatiue, without any reference to the vertuous or vicious working & operation of the *Will*, deryued from them; then with greater shewe of reason in a vulgar iudgment, it might be auerred, (that supposing they teach not the fundamentall points of Christian fayth) they might be either affirmatiuely or negatiuely houlden, without any daunger of saluation: such were the Heresyes of (b) Origen, teaching, that the Diuells in the end of the world should be saued: Of Cyprian touching Rebaptization, and diuers such like, from the maintayning of which points either way, the *Will* in respect of any externall working or operation drawne from thence, can sucke noe poyson.

(b) *See heerof S. Augustine Haref. 43.*

But the Case is farre different in the former Doctrines set downe aboue; for we fynd that the sayd Doctrines (which breath nothing but all dissolution and turpitude of manners) euen in speculation do most forcibly & immediately touch the pulse of the *Will*; the *Will* strongly beating, and indeed brea-

breaking out into outward actions of vic
and lyberty, according as ſhee remayne
afore infected with the contagion and poy
ſon of the former Doctrinall ſpeculations.
Well then, this vpon neceſſary inference be
ing graunted, ſo as the working, effect, and
force of the ſayd Doctrines are in the *Will*,
nothing but liberty, diſſolution of manner
improbitie, ſenſualitie and ſinne, I referre
the iudgment of any man, whether the ſaye
Doctrines be but points of Indifferency o
noe, and may be defended either way, wi
thout preiudice to the beleiuers fayth, an
daunger to his Saluation, as our *Formaliſt*
doe auerre. For can it poſſibly be conceaue
that theſe Doctrines ſhould be reputed as in
different to mans Saluatiō, or in themſelue
true, which (as is proued) moſt ſtrongl
drawe the *will to* all vice, againſt which Go
hath thundred out ſuch dreadfull threats,
as where it is ſayd: *Pſal. 91. All they that work
iniquity, ſhalbe confounded.* And againe, *Eccle
ſiaſt. 40. Death, blood, contention, edge of ſword
oppreſſion, hunger, contrition, whippes are create
for ſinners.* And further, Pſal. 9. 10. *God ſha
raigne ſnares of fyre vpon ſinners, brimſtone wit
tempeſtuous wynds ſhalbe the portion of their cupp*
(c) *Matth.* 25. (c) & our Sauiour ſpeaking of Sinners ſaith
Depart you accurſed, into euerlaſting fire, Beſide
infinite other places of like nature.

Now

Now to the former Premiſes, may I adioyne the Confeſſions euen of Proteſtants themſelues, who confeſſe that the liues of Catholikes are commonly farre more vertuous and of better edification, then the liues of the Proteſtants; who by their owne acknowledgments, lye groueling in all ſenſuatie: For thus euen Luther ſayth heereof: *When we were* (d) *ſeduced by the Pope, euery man did willingly followe good works; and now euery man neither ſayth, nor knoweth any thing, but how to get all to himſelfe by exaction, pillage, theft, lying, vſury &c.* to which Confeſſiō (to omit diuers others) (e) *Muſculus* a forward Proteſtāt ſubtribeth, ſayng: *Vt verum fateor &c. That I may confeſſe the truthe heerein, they are become vnlike to themſelues, that whereas in the Papacy they were Religious in their Errours and Superſtition; now in the light of the knowne truth, they are more profane, then the very Sonnes of the worlde.* Which diſparity of liues and conuerſation can be iuſtly aſcribed to no other cauſe, then in that the Proteſtants were ready to put in practiſe, what afore they had learned by ſpeculation of their owne Doctrines: which point then being thus, I meane that the Doctrine of the Proteſtants do depreſſe vertue, and blandiſh, contenance, and exalt vice, and thereupon the liues of the Proteſtants by confeſſion of themſelues, and to the diſedy-

(d) Domi. nica 26. poſt Trinitatem.

(e) In loc. com. cap. de Decalogo. in explanat. tertij præcepti.

edyfying of their followers) are becom
actually farre worse, and lesse vertuous, the
the liues of the Catholikes; I here demaund
how it can be warranted by any shew
reason, that these Doctrines of the Prote
stants (begetting so great a chaunge fro
vertue to vice, in their professours) can
reputed, but as points of Indifferency? O
that men believing them, practising the
in their conuersation, and finally dying
them can be saued? So contrary it is to o
(f) Mat. 19. Sauiours prescript: *If thou (f) wilt enter into l
keep the Commaundements.* Sinne being inde
so great an enemy to mans Saluation, as th
God himselfe vouchsafed to be incarnate,
to suffer an opprobrious death, only for t
taking away of the sinnes of the world.

*THE SAME PROVED FRO
the fearefull deaths of the first broachers of P
testancy.*

CHAP. XII.

IN this next place, we will br
fly take a suruey of the particu
deaths of some few of the chie
Protestants, who haue byn t
first stampers or broachers of the Contro
sies betweene the Catholikes and the Pr
testants; & then we will leaue to the ind
me

ent of others, whether thoſe kinds of death befal (in Gods accuſtomed proceedings) men, who firſt did ſet on foote and maintayne points and poſitions of Religion of that Indifferency, as that either the believing not believing of them, may well comport, and ſtand togeather with mans ſalvation.

To beginne with *Luther*, omitting to ſpeake either of his vicious life, or of the liues of others heereafter ſet downe, though confeſſed and diſplayed for ſuch, by many of their owne Brethren; It is certayne, that Luther (g) dyed very ſudainly: for when at ſupper being in good health, he had fed ſumptuouſly vpon great variety of meates, & entertayned his gueſts then with him, with witty (but diſſolute) diſcourſes, the very ſame night he dyed.

Zwinglius was ſlayne in the warrs of Germany, vndertaken for Religion only, in which warres he dyed not as a Preacher, but as a warriour & armed in the field; and yet in ſuch ſort, that Gualterus (an earneſt Proteſtant) ſayth thus of him: (h) *Noſtri illi &c. Diuers of vs are not affrayd to pronounce Zwinglius to haue dyed in ſinne, and therefore to haue dyed the ſame of Hell.*

(g) *Cochlæus in vita Lutheri.* Whoſe ſudden death is alſo confeſſed by Dauid Chitræus (an eminent Proteſtant) *in orat. funebri Chriſtophori Ducis Megapolitani,*

I Oecolampadius (a) *Oecolampadius* (a) *Oecolampadius* (a) *Oecolampadius*

Oecolampadius (the reputed Bishop of Basill, where he lyeth buried, and a man most forward in spreading the points of Protestacy) went healthfull to bed, but was found by his wife, dead in the morning in his bed.

Andreas Carolstadius an eminent Protestant, and a great aduauncer of the supposed Ghospell, was killed by the Diuell, as certayne (k) ministers, euen of *Basill*, do iustify.

Iacobus Andreas a famous Lutheran, and in other points an earnest Protestant, *lyued and dyed* (as (l) Hospinian the Protestant wryteth,) *as if he had had no God, but Mammon or Bacchus; he neuer praying neyther going to bed, nor rysing from thence*, and that in the residue of his life he shewed no Godlines. Who (*) also *was once taken in Adultery.*

Caluin (the refiner of all Protestancy, and chiefe supporter of all controuerted points agaynst the Catholikes) dyed being consumed with lyce and wormes, extremely blaspheming agaynst God: of whose death (m) Conradus Schlusselburg (a famous Protestant) thus wryteth: *Deus manu sua potenti &c. God with his mighty hand did visit Caluin; for he despayred of his saluation, called vpon the Diuell and gaue vp his soule swearing and blaspheming. Caluin dyed being eaten away with lyce; for they* [illegible] *bre*

Caluins death, as he witnesseth in his *libello de vita Caluini.*

(i) *Cochlaeus in Acts Lutheri 1517.*

(k) In their Epistle *de morte Carolstadij.*

(l) *Hospinian. in histor. Sacra. part. 2. fol. 389.*

(*) So Zâchius the Protestât affirmeth in his Epistles printed. 1609. l. 2. p. 340.

(m) *In Theolog. Caluinist. l. 1. fol. 72.* This particular manner of Caluins death is witnessed by Ioannes Herennius (a Caluinist preacher) who was present at

bred about his priuy members, that none about him could endure the ſtench, and ſmell. Thus far the foreſayd Proteſtant.

Finally *Melanchthon* (a great pillar of Proteſtancy) made ſo bad an end, as that *Morlinus* (his owne ſcholler, and a forward Proteſtant) deſpayred of his ſaluation, thus writing in his publike Lectures: *Si poſſem redimere &c. If I could redeeme the Saluation of our mayſter Philip Melanchthon with the perill of my life, I would do it: But he is caryed to the horrible tribunall of God, to plead his cauſe there &c.* See hereof alſo *Sluſſelburge in Theolog. Calu. l. 2. art. 10.*

Now then, ſeeing all theſe men believed all the fundamental points of Chriſtian Religion (as the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Paſſion, &c.) ſeeing alſo they were the moſt principall men, that firſt introduced & diſſeminated Proteſtacy throghout the world; ſpending their whole liues in ſpreading and defending the ſame, by their wrytings: Finally ſeeing God did cut them off by ſuch calamitous, miſerable and prodigious deaths (which is to be feared were but preſages of the eternall deaths of their ſoules) who can otherwiſe be perſwaded, but that all this was wrought by the iuſt hand of God; not ſo much for their perſonall ſinnes, proceeding of humane frailty (for there were and are many others as great ſinners as they, and

yet escaped such dreadfull ends) but for their first inuenting, maintayning, and preaching of the Protestant fayth and Religion, and empoysoning almost all Countreyes with such their false & sensuall doctrines: which being graunted, how then can it with any truth of reason be supposed, that the positions of Protestancy impugned by the Catholikes, should contayne nothing but matters of Indifferency, or that a man whether he belieue them, or not belieue them, may alike and indifferently be saued?

THE SAME PROVED FROM the doctrine of Recusancy, taught both by Catholikes and Protestants.

CHAP. XIII.

I Haue thought good to draw another argument from the common, taught and approued doctrine of *Recusancy* in euery Religiō; though this head may seeme to haue a speciall reference to the reason afore touched, & in part be therein implicity included; wherein is shewed that nature herselfe hath imprinted in the professours of all Religions, a Religious care punctually to keep and preserue euery article of their Religion.

Now

Now heere we are to premoniſh, that if in the iudgement of all learned men (both Catholike and Proteſtant) it is thought an action moſt wicked, & vnlawfull, and not to be performed but (without finall repentance) vnder payne of eternall damnation, that a man ſhould communicate only in going to the Church, and in hearing but a ſermen, contrary to that Religion which himſelfe belieueth for true; (though this may ſeeme to be coloured vnder pretenſe of obſeruing the Princes commaundement, & for feare of looſing our temporall eſtates,) I ſay, if this action be thought vnlawfull, wherin neuertheleſſe the performers thereof doe not punctually vndertake to maintayne or belieue any one Hereticall or erroneous poſition; how then can it be reputed as conſonant to reaſon or Religion, that men belieuing different opinions of fayth, and promiſcuouſly communicating in prayer with a contrary Religion to their owne, ſhould neuertheleſſe all be ſaued? ſince the firſt fault cõſiſteth (as ſome would interprete, though falſely) only in an externall and *materiall* (as the Schoolemẽ ſpeake) going to the Church of a different Religion; whereas this other doth directly and openly reſt in defending articles (at leaſt in its owne iudgment) of a Religion contrary to the truth of Chriſtian

Religion: for such is the case herein eyther of Catholikes or Protestants. But before we particulerly enter into this discourse, we will heere insist (as most pertinent to our purpose) in relating the two most religious Examples of *Eleazar*, and the *Widow with her seauen Sonnes*, recorded in the Bookes of the Machabees.

(1) 2. *Machab. c. 6.* Touching the first, we reade, (1) that *Eleazar* (being a most auncient, graue, and learned Man) was so far from eating of the meates sacrifized to Idolls (according to the prohibition of the Iewish lawe) that when certaine men, as tendring his old age, and moued thereto, as the Text sayth, *iniqua misseratione, through vnlawfull pitty*, proffered him other flesh to eate, vnder colour whereof they would tell the Tyrant King (thereby to saue his lyfe) that he had eaten of the sacrifized meates; that he did choose rather to vndergoe a most cruell death, then to feigne, that he had eaten of the sayd sacrifized flesh. And so accordingly he suffered most glorious Martyrdome; thus speaking to God in the middest of his torments: (2) *For thy feare (ô Lord) I do suffer these things.*

(2) *Vbi supra.*

(3) 2. *Machab. c. 7.* As concerning the (3) *Widdow with her seauen Sonnes*: O what spirituall resolution appeared in them all? Indeed able to vp braid vs Christiãs with our luk-warmne

in profeſſing our fayth. They all ſuffered moſt exquiſit torments, and in the end moſt bloudy deaths, only becauſe they would not at the Kings command, eate of Swynes fleſh, which was contrary to the Lawe of Moyſes. And this both the Mother (ſtill exhorting her ſonnes to conſtancy heerein) & all her ſeauen Sonns performed with ſuch an admirable reſolution, both in their anſweres to the Tyrant during their torments, and in their patience of ſuffering death, as that conſidering her ſex, and the tendernes of their yeares, it might be truly ſayd, that weaknes was heere able to inſtruct ſtrength, and youth old age.

Now from theſe two moſt remarkable Examples, I thus argue: The tyme of the old Teſtament was much inferior in worth, dignity, and many priuiledges to the new teſtament, ſeing *to them in the Old, things* (as the (4) Apoſtle witneſſeth) *did happen, as in a figure*; whereas the *new Teſtament* (5) (as the ſayd Apoſtle affirmeth) *is eſtablished in better promiſſes*. But now if in the old Teſtament, men did chooſe to endure moſt cruel deaths, rather then they would (contrary to the Law) eate forbiden Meates, which in themſelues were lawfully to be eaten, were it not for the prohibition annexed vnto them; And ſeeing though they had conſented to

(4) 1. Cor. 10.

(5) Hebr. 8.

the eating of them, yet this being but an externall Act or Ceremony, they might neuertheleſſe inwardly haue retayned and kept their true beliefe touching the Law; yet ſince the performãce of ſo ſmall a matter as it appeared in outward ſhow, could not be without greate ſinne, and damnation to the party ſo offending; Shall any Chriſtian thinke, that now in the tyme of Grace, and of the New Teſtament, which tyme exacteth more perfection at our hands (*for* (6) *whome much is giuen, of him much shalbe* (6) Luc. 12. *quyred*;) that men profeſſing to belieue (with contempt of the Churches authority interpoſed therein) contrary articles touching Chriſtian Religion, and dying in ſuch their different fayths (in which the one ſyde muſt of neceſſity mantayne a falſe fayth) that men (I ſay) of both theſe ſides can be ſaued, it is againſt all force of Reaſõ, againſt the iudgment of the Primitiue Church, and finally againſt Gods Iuſtice.

And thus far concerning the two foreſayd exáples in the *Machabees*: Which Bookes admitting them for the tyme, not to be diuine Scripture; yet it is acknowledged of all ſydes, that the Hiſtories recorded in them are true; and that *Eleazar*, and the *Widow with her ſeauen Sonns*, performed moſt worthy examples of piety and Religion; and that

the

they had yielded to the Kings Command in eating of forbidden meates, they had (as violating the law giuen to them by God) without repentance, incurred damnation. And this is the iudgment of the *auncient Fathers, Catholike Doctours, and the learned Protestants*. But let vs descend more particulerly to the doctryne of *Recusancy*, and examine whether it be lawfull to exhibite our selues present at that Church in tyme of diuine service or of preaching, the doctrine of which Church, we hould in our Conscience to be erroneous, and false.

Now, that this kind of going to the Church of a different Religion, is wholly condemned as most vnlawfull and wicked; I first proue from the iudgment of the Protestants, secondly from the resolutions of the Catholiks. And to beginne with the Protestants, we find this kinde of Recusancy (I meane to be present at the Sermons or prayers of a different Religion) is taught by (a) *Caluin*, the (b) Deuines of *Germany*, by (c) Melancton, by *Peter* (*) *Martyr*, & finally (to omit others) by Doctour *Willet*, (d) who for the better fortifying and warranting of the sayd opinion, produceth his Testimonies

(a) *De vitandis superstitionibus extant in Caluini Tract. Theolog. p. 584.*

(b) Alledged by Sleydan Com. Englished. l. 7. fol. 87. (c) In Concil. Theolog. p. 628. (*) In his discourse hereof recited by Melancton, in his Treatise of Concil. Theolog. p. 634. 635. (d) In his Synops. printed 1600. p. 612. 613. &c.

nies from the authorities of *Latimer*, *Bradford*, *Philpot*, *Ridley* & others, diuers of which according to this their doctrine suffered death in Queene Maries tyme, as appeareth out of the Acts and monuments of Iohn fox. And thus much for the Protestants.

That the Catholikes doe with the like or greater feruour teach & practise this Recusancie, is cleare by the example of our owne Countrey; where since Protestancy was first planted, many scores of venerable & learned Priests haue chosen rather to suffer death, then that they would change their Religion, or goe once to the Protestants Church; their liues being commonly proffered them, if so they would cõforme themselues, and leaue their recusancy. In like sort many hundreds of the Laity pay yearely great summes of money for their recusancy; diuers of them enduring further oppressions disgraces, and imprisonments only for the same cause, through the malice, rigour, and couetuousnes of certaine subordinate Magistrates vnder his Maiesty (whose clemency is most remarkable, and whome God long preserue in a holy gouernement ouer vs) being heerein mightily wronged through the false and most iniurious informations of their Aduersaries.

Now, that the doctrine of learned Catholikes

holikes is answeareable to the practice herein, appeareth from the frequent testimonies of diuers learned men of the Catholike Church of this tyme: yet for greater brevity, I will insist in the Authorities only of three, to wit, of *Cardinall Baronius*, *Cardinall Bellarmine*, (the two late lampes of Gods Church) and of *Mutius Vitelleſcus*, then but Prouinciall, now *Generall* and Head of the *Iesuites* diſperſed throughout Chriſtendome. For ſome yeares paſt, their iudgment being demaunded, whether the Catholikes of England for the ſauing of their goods, lyuings, and liberty, might goe to the Proteſtants Church or no, to heare a ſermō only, though otherwayes they did not communicate in Prayer & Sacraments with the Proteſtants; for the warranting or diſallowing whereof there were ſeuerall reaſons brought on either ſide, all which reaſons were propoſed and expreſſed to theſe three worthy men. Theſe three learned & holy men then (beſides diuers others eminent Doctors and wryters, whom I heare omit) did giue their negatiue ſentence therein, whoſe particuler words in Latin, I haue thought good heere to ſet downe.

The

The Iudgment of Cardinall Baronius

VISIS, & conſideratis quæ ſuperiùs diligen perueſtigatione in vtramque partem ſunt d putata, reiectis omnino & exſufflatis, quæ pro pa affirmatiua fuêre propoſita, quod ſcilicet liceret C tholicis adire Eccleſias Hæreticorum, vt ſuperiùs ſ propoſita, inhæremus ſaniori ſententiæ poſteriori, Eccleſia Catholica antiquitùs receptæ, & vſu prob tæ; quod ſcilicet id facere pijs non liceat. Quam re noſtros Catholicos Anglos amplecti ex animo.

C. Card. Baronius, tit. S. Nerei & Achillei Pres.

That is, I hauing ſeene and conſidered (mea ning in the Queſtion of Engliſh Catholik going to church) all thoſe points which haue b diſputed of on both ſides, but reiecting and wholly bandoning all the reaſons alleadged for the affirm tiue part (to wit, to proone that it was lawfull f Catholikes to goe to the Heretikes Church,) I do a here to the more ſound and later opinion, which a ciently was receaued of the Catholike Church, a allowed by vſe and cuſtome; That is, that it is lawfull for pious and godly men ſo to doe. And I treate all our Engliſh Catholiks to imbrace this opinion and iudgement.

Cæſar Cardinall Baronius, Prieſt of the ti of the Church of SS. Nereus & Achill

The Iudgement of Cardinall Bellarmine.

CONSIDERATIS rationibus pro vtraque parte allatis, existimo non licere viris Catholicis in Anglia Hæreticorum Ecclesias adire; multominùs concionibus illorum interesse; minimè autem omnium cum ipsis in precibus & psalmodia, atque ipsorum Ecclesiasticis ritibus conuenire. In fidem propria manu subscripsi.

R. Bellarminus, S. R. E. Presb. Card. Tit. S. Ma. in via.

Thus in English. The reasons brought vpon both sides considered (meaning touching the lawfulnes or vnlawfulnes of English Catholiks going to the Protestants Church) I am perswaded, that it is not lawfull for English Catholikes to go to the Churches of Heretikes; much lesse to be present at their Seruices; but least of all to communicate with them in prayers, and singing of psalmes, and other their Ecclesiasticall rites and customes. And therfore this my iudgement herein I haue subscribed with my owne hand.

Robert Bellarmyne, Priest & Cardinall of the holy Roman Church, of the Title of the Church of S. Maria in via.

The

The Sentence of Mutius Vitelleſcus then Prouinciall, but now Generall, & Head of the Order of the Ieſuites.

VIDI rationes, quæ in hoc ſcripto pro vtra parte afferuntur, & exiſtimo non licere v Catholicis in Anglia Eccleſias Hæreticorum adire puto hoc debere eſſe extra Controuerſiam.

Mutius Vitelleſcus Prou. R Soc. IESV.

In Engliſh. *I haue ſeene the reaſons, wh are alleadged in this booke or wryting, for both p (meaning for going, or not going to the Proteſta Church) & I am of opinion that it is not lawfull f Catholikes in England to goe to the Churches of H retikes: and I am perſuaded, that this point ou to be ous of all Controuerſy.*

Mutius Vitelleſcus Prouinciall the Society of Ieſus in Ro

And thus far touching the ſentences o theſe three learned men, deliuered in wa ranting the doctrine of Recuſancy in C tholikes.

Now to reflect backe vpon the promiſe

If the going to the Church of another Religion (for auoyding of temporall losses, (and only to heare a sermon of the said Religion) be to be accounted a Sinne, not be done vnder payne of damnation, as being presumed to beare an externall conformity to a false Religion (as by all the former testimonies aboue alleaged is plentifully proued) though the party so offending, may perhapps truly believe all points of Christiã Religion: with what reason then can it be warranted, that both Catholiks and Protestants, conspiring only in the fundamentall points of the Trinity, Incarnation &c. but differing mainly in all other points of Religion, yet neuertheless promiscuously communicating one with another in prayer and the Sacraments, can ioyntly be saued? especially seeing it is certayne, that the one part defendeth not matters of Indifferency (as is commõly supposed) but iniustifiable errours, or rather (to speake as the truth is) manifest and grosse Heresies.

THE

THE SAME PROVED FROM *the writings of the Catholikes and Protestants, wherein reciprocally they charge one another with Heresy. Also from the Insurrections, Warrs and Rebellions, begun only for Religion.*

CHAP. XIIII.

IF there were no other reason to be alleadged, in disproofe & confutation of this plurality of Religions, them this following, it might seeme fully preuayling in all cleare iudgements, not wholy darkened with the myst of earthly and temporall respects. It is this. First, the wonderfull and implacable Bookwarrs between Catholikes and Protestants, wholy vndertaken in defence of their seuerall Religions: and yet both the Catholikes and the Protestants professe to believe in the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Passion &c. Secondly, the pressures and calamities, with which diuers states and countreyes do afflict other states, as also the Insurrection of Subiects agaynst their naturall Princes, only for difference of Religion; not contayning themselues, till they burst forth into open hostility and armes for defending their owne Religion, & subuerting of the other

To-

Touching the firſt, good God! how many men on all ſides, ſince the firſt appearing of Luther, haue ſpent their whole times, & all their ſeruiceable yeares, in writing, diſputing, and preaching in defence of their owne Religion, & impugning of their aduerſaryes; accounting the maintayners & belieuers thereof, as Heretikes, & pronouncing eternall damnation agaynſt them? Witneſſes hereof are the Libraryes of all the famous vniuerſities of Chriſtendome; the Stationers ſhoppes in all great Cittyes, and laſtly the Annuall Mart of Bookes returned theſe many yeares from Frankford. And is it poſſible, that ſo much paynes, trauayle, & labour of writing and otherwiſe, accompanyed with ſo great charges, ſhould be vndertaken for queſtions only of Indifferency, & ſuch, as it importeth nothing at all, touching the gayning of Heauen, and auoyding of Hell, what a man belieueth therein, or of what ſide he relyeth?

Concerning the ſecond point, which is the calamityes, afflictions, & warres, which diuers States, Countreyes, and Kingdomes doe proſecute agaynſt their neighbours, and all originally for matter of Religion; as alſo touching the open rebellion of the ſubiects agaynſt their lawfull Soueraignes, only for the ſayd occaſion; the laſt fifty

yeares, as alſo theſe very tymes do giue ouer-lamētable examples hereof. Witneſſes of this matter (purpoſely to forbeare the preſidents of our own Coūtrey) is Scotlād, into which Countrey, Knox, Goodman, and Bucanan, with other their Agents and confederates, firſt introduced Proteſtancy by force, and armes: A point ſo acknowledged, that Doctor Bancroft late pretēded Archbiſhop of Canterbury, as wholly inueyghing agaynſt ſuch violent proceedings, made a booke of that ſubiect, entituling it: *Of the proceedings of the Scottiſh Myniſters, according to the Geneuian rule of Reformation.*

Touching *France*, who knoweth not that for this laſt fifty yeares, till the laſt King of France became Catholike, there haue by alwayes almoſt open warres, betweene the State of France, & the Hugnotts of France vndertaken by the Hugnotts only for Religion. And doth not the Citty of *Rochell*, with ſome other Cittyes at this day, ſtand out agaynſt their King, vnder pretext of defence of their Ghoſpell?

The occurrents of the *Low Countreys*, & *the Hollanders* are no leſſe remarkable herein, of whoſe firſt taking of armes agaynſt their lawfull King only for Religion, (a) Oſiander, an earneſt Proteſtant, thus confeſſeth: *They of the low Countreys by publike wrytings re-*

(a) *In Epitom. Cent. 16. p. 941.*

nounce

nounced all subiection and obedience to Philip their Lord & King. And (b) agayne. *When foure hundred of them, of good respect, had sued for liberty of Religion, and could not preuayle; the impatient people stirred vp with fury, at Antwerpe, and other places of Holland, Zeland, and Flanders, did throw and breake downe Images.* But of the proceedings & Rebellions of the low Countreymen agaynst their King only for cause of Religion, it is needles to speake further, seeing it is too well known to all mén of any impartiall iudgment and vnderstanding. (b) Osiand. vbi sup. 81.

I will not much insist in the Example of *Switzerland*, which consisting of twelue or thirteene *Cantons*, or Shyres, halfe of the number of them did * ryse vp in armes agaynst the other, and by force of armes did set vp the Protestant Religion among them. And so the halfe of the *Cantons* doe continue Protestant to this very day. The battalls fought among them (only for Religiō) were many and most cruell; and in one of them Zwinglius (the chiefe inciter of the rest) was slayne. * See of this Osiander in Epitom. Eccles. histor. Cen. 16. pag. 203. as also D. Bancroft in his survey, p. 13. and Cochlæus in acts Lutheri.

I passe ouer *Geneua*, which Citty (as the whole world knoweth) did first withdraw it selfe from the allegiance of their tempotall Liege Lord, only by reason that agaynst his will and pleasure, they would professe the Protestant Religion; and so accordingly to

this day they haue made themſelues a State or Commonwealth, wholly independent of Sauoy; of which Citty thus D. (b) Sutcliffe confeſſedly wryteth: *They of Geneua did depoſe their Catholike Liege Lord and Prince, from his temporall right, albeit he was by right of ſucceſſion their temporall Lord, and owner of that Citty & Territory.*

(b) In his anſwere to a certayne libel ſupplicatory. pag. 194.

In like ſort, I pretermit the many like examples of the Commons, ryſing agaynſt their lawfull Princes and magiſtrates in (c) *Sueueland*, (d) *Denmarke*, (e) *Poland*, and (f) *Germany*; And which ryſings, Inſurrections, and rebellions were originally vndertaken only for Religion; and haue no doubt (ſince Luthers firſt breach) coſt the liues in all places of many hundred thouſand men; & haue actually depoſed & diſthroned diuers Kings and Princes of their ſtates and territoryes.

(c) See Chitræus in Chron 1593. & 1594.

(d) See hereof the acknowledgment of M. Fulke in his anſwere to Farines declamations. p. 35.

These things then, for their euidency being cõfeſſed for true & vndeniable (many of which yet remayne freſh in our owne memory) of the nature of which Actions I wil not heere diſpute; only I heere vrge, that it is more then incredible, that ſuch rebellions and deuaſtations of Countreyes, beſieging of Cittyes, depoſing of Princes, ſlaughter of ſo many hundred thouſands of men, ſhould

(e) See Oſiander hereof in Epitom. Cent. 16. pag. 115.

(f) See the acknowledgement hereof by D. Bilſon in his true defence part. 3. pag. 270. & 273.

ſhould be practiſed almoſt throughout all Chriſtendome, within this laſt threeſcore yeares, only for admitting, or not admitting the differences betweene the Proteſtants & Catholikes Religion, if both the contrary partyes were not perſuaded, that vpon the true or falſe beliefe of theſe Controuerſies in Religion, their ſoules Saluation or damnation for all eternity were to depend; For it is certayne, that all theſe contrary partyes did agree and conſpire in the generall beliefe of the Trinity, Incarnation, Paſſion, death of our Sauiour, and reciting of the Apoſtles Creed: And therefore for theſe doctrines ſuch bloudy proceedings were not attempted.

THE SAME PROVED, FROM the Proteſtants mutually condemning one another of Hereſy, and for Heretikes.

CHAP. XV.

IF Proteſtants doe maintaine, that their different opinions ſeuerally houlden amonge themſelues be Hereſies, and that the belieuers of them, are for ſuch their falſe beliefe (if they ſo dye therein) not capable of ſaluation; then *à fortiori*, may we be bould

to pronounce, that the Controuerſies of fayth betweene the Catholiks and Proteſtants are not of that middle nature, but that the opinions and ſentences on the one ſyde are to be reputed for manifeſt Hereſies, and ſuch as cannot ſtand with mans ſaluation. This inference is moſt neceſſary, ſince on all ſides it is acknowledged, that there is a farre greater diſparity in Religion betweene the Catholikes and the Proteſtants, then there is betweene the Proteſtants among themſelues.

Now, that the Proteſtants doe hould one another for Heretikes, it cannot be denyed: for to inſiſt firſt in the Controuerſies touching the reall Preſence, maintayned in their ſenſe by the Lutherans, but denyed by the Sacramentaries; we find, that Luther thus writeth of the Sacramentaries: (h) *We cenſure in earneſt the Zwinglians, and all the Sacramentaries for Heretikes, and alienated from the Church of God.* And againe, the ſame Luther thus writeth, tom. 7. Wittenb. fol. 381. *I do proteſt before God and the worlde, that I doe not agree with the Zwinglians, nor euer will while the world ſtandeth, but will haue my hands cleare from the bloude of the sheepe, which theſe Heretikes* (marke his wordes) *do driue from Chriſt, deceaue, & kill.* And againe in the former place: *Curſed be the charity & concord of the Sacramen-*

(h) *Contra articulos Louanienſes. Theſ. 27. tom. 2.*

tarie

uaries for euer and euer, to all eternitie. But Heretikes, and men alienated from the Church of God, and which do kill the sheepe of Christ, during such their condition, are not in state of Saluation. Now, of Luther and his doctrine, we finde this bitter recrimination vsed by the Tigurine Deuines, who were Zwinglians or Caluinists: (i) *Nos condemnatam & execrabilem sectam vocat &c. Luther calleth vs a damnable and execrable sect; but let him looke, lest he doth not declare himselfe an Arch-heretike, seing he cannot, nor will not haue society with those that confesse Christ.* And Zwinglius in tom. 2. ad Respons. Lutheri, thus wryteth: *Behold how Sathan endeauours to possesse this man,* meaning *Luther.*

(i) *Tigurinistract. 3. contra supremam Lutheri Confessionem. p. 614.*

But to proceed to other points: Nicolaus (1) Gallus (an eminent Protestant and Superintendent at Ratisbone) thus wryteth of the contentions betweene the Protestants themselues. *Non sunt leues &c. The dissentions that are among vs, are not light, nor of light matters; but of the greatest articles of Christian doctrine, of the Law and the Ghospell, of Iustification and good works, of the Sacraments, and vse of Ceremonies.*

(1) *In his Thesib. & Hypothesib.*

Cōradus (2) Schlussenburge (an other famous Protestant) alleadgeth Pappus a Protestant, thus complayning against the Caluinists: *Est initio de vno tantùm articulo &c.*

(2) *In Theolog. Caluin. l. 1. art. 28.*

Although in the beginning one only article was called into doubt &c. Notwithstanding the Caluinists are now so far gone, as that they call in doubt neither few, neither the least articles of Christian Doctrine: for now we dissent from them, touching the Omnipotency of God, the Personall vnion of two Natures in Christ &c.

(3) In their mild defence of the silenced ministers supplication, to the Court of Parlamēt.

But to come neerer home: The (3) Puritanes heere of England thus complaine of the Protestants: *Doe we vary from the syncere Doctrine of the Scriptures? Nay rather many of them doe much more swarue from the same &c.* And thus answereably we find, that the Puritans hould the Bishops of England Antichristian; whereas the Protestants do teach, that of necessity Bishops are to be in the Church of God.

(4) In his Meditation vpon the 122. Psalme.

D. Willet (4) speaking of diuers opinions, taught by the more moderate Protestants, as Hooker, D. Couell, and others, thus wryteth: *From this foundation haue sprong forth these and other such wirlepooles and bubbles of new doctrine; as that Christ is not originally God:* & then after he thus concludeth: *Thus haue some bene bould to teach and wryte, who as some Schismatikes* (meaning heerby the Puritans) *haue disturbed the peace of the Church one way in externall matters concerning discipline, so they haue troubled the Church another way, in opposing themselues, by new quirkes & deuices, to the soundnes of*

Doctrine

Doctrine among Proteſtants.

M. Parkes in his booke dedicated to the then Archbiſhop D. Bancroft, thus wryteth of the proceedings of ſome Proteſtants heere in England: (5) *They are headſtrong & hardened in Errour, they ſtrike at the mayne points of fayth, ſhaking the foundation it ſelfe, and calling to queſtion Heauen and Hell, the diuinity & humanity, yea the very ſoule, and ſaluation of our Sauiour himſelfe.* And agayne more plainely in the former place, he ſayth thus: *They haue peſtilent Hereſies:* and yet more, *They are Heretical & ſacrilegious.*

(5) Epiſt. dedicat.

To conclude this point of their particuler ſayings and redargutions heerein, D. (6) Couell repeating & regiſtring the Poſitions of the Puritans heere in England, among other of their poſitions ſetteth downe theſe following: *The Statute congregations of England are no true Churches.* And agayne· *The Proteſtant Church of England is no Church at all.* And yet more: *The Proteſtant Church of England hath no forme of a Church.*

(6) In his defence of Hooker pag. 65. & 74. & 75.

Now, that all theſe diſſentions among Engliſh Proteſtants cannot be interpreted only about indifferencyes & Ceremonyes, or about Gouerment (as ſome Proteſtants doe anſwere, when they are charged heerewith by the Catholikes,) beſides that their owne former Confeſſions are extended to

diuers high articles, the foresayd M. (7) Parks plainly and truly confesseth the contrary, saying: *The Protestants deceaue the world, and make men beleeue, there is agreement in all substantiall points; they affirme, there is no question among them of the truth.*

(7) *Vbi supra pag.* 30.

Now the former point is furthermore made euident, by the reciprocall deportmẽt and demeanour of Protestants amongst thẽselues; for first (besides the charging one another with flat Heresy (as is aboue shewed) they do not only prohibit the (8) reading of ech others bookes, but also they set downe articles of visitation for the enquiry and apprehending (k) of such their aduersaryes; & being apprehended they commit them to prison; yea further they proceed, not allowing the (m) trauaylers of eyther party common entertaynement, due in all nations to strangers. Finally their dissentions are so implacable among them (though all be Protestants) as that in defence of their seuerall doctrines they haue with great hostility taken (n) armes one against another, as appeareth (to omit for breuity all other Presidẽts) by the late memorable example in Holland, of the *Arminians* and *Gomorists*, who only for some

(8) In Concil. Theolog. part. 1. pag. 249.

(k) *Hospinian. vbi supra.*

(l) *Hospinian. vbi supra.*

(m) So relateth Osiander in Epitom. Cent. 16. pag. 608. &c.

Conradus Schlusſenb. Catalog. Hæret. l. 13. & vltimo. (n) This is shewed and exemplifyed by Hospinian vbi supra fol. 395. & 397. in like sort by Osiander in Epitom. p. 735.

ſome difference touching *Freewill* between them, did ryſe in hoſtile manner agaynſt their aduerſaryes; and ceaſed not that courſe, till *Barneuelt* the chiefe of one ſide and faction was beheaded. All which violence and extremity of courſes would neuer haue byn vndertakē, if the diuerſity of doctrine (which is the cauſe of ſuch & ſo great exorbitancies) did conſiſt only in things indifferent of thēſelues, and ſuch as did not concerne the neceſſity of ſaluation.

The ſayd point touching the Proteſtants diſſentions in eſſentiall articles of faith, is laſtly cleerly manifeſted, by taking a view of their bookes written one agaynſt another: (thogh this method is partly inuolued in the diſplaying of their particuler condemning ſentences aboue alleadged) the nūber wherof amounteth to diuers hundreds; yet as deſirous to be ſhort & compendious, I will ſet downe the Tytles only of twenty of them; euen from which Titles the Indifferent Reader may iudge, whether the Authours of thē (being all eminent Proteſtants) did maintayne the ſubiects of their ſayd bookes, to be matters of Indifferency, and ſuch as may be eyther way houlden without breach of that true fayth which is neceſſary to mans Saluation. And further I will forbeare to reckon within this number any booke written eyther

eyther for, or against the reall Presence maintayned by the Lutherans, because therein they conspire partly with vs Catholikes, & consequently the controuersy herein ariseth not only betweene the Protestants themselues, but also betweene them and vs. And for more satisfaction of the Reader, I haue also Englished the sayd twenty Titles, from which, coniecture may easily be made, in what bitter style the bookes were wrytten.

1. First then may be reckoned that booke entituled: *Oratio de Incarnatione filij Dei, contra impios & blasphemos errores Zwinglianorum & Caluinistarũ*, printed *Tubingæ*, Anno Domini 1586.

An Oration, or Speach of the Incarnation of the Sõne of God, against the wicked and blasphemous errours of the Swinglians and Caluinists.

2. *Alberti Graueri Bellum Iohannis Caluini, & Iesu Christi.* Braptæ, 1598. in 4.

The warre of Iohn Caluin and Iesus Christ, written by Albertus Grauerus.

3. *Anti-Paræus: Hoc est, Refutatio venenati scripti à Dauide Paræo editi, in defensione strophaarum, & corruptelarum, quibus Iohannes Caluinus illustrißima Scripturæ testimonia de mysterio Trinitatis, nec non oracula Prophetarum de Christo, detestandum in modum corrupit.* Francofurti, 1598.

Anti-

Anti-Paræus, that is, a Refutation of a venemous booke, written by Dauid Pareus in defence of the Deceites & Corruptions, by the which Iohn Caluin hath deteſtably abuſed, or wreſted the moſt cleere teſtimonyes of Scripture, touching the Myſtery of the Trinity, and the Oracles of the Prophets touching Chriſt.

AEgidij Hunnij Caluinus Iudaizans: Hoc eſt, Iudaicæ gloſſæ & corruptelæ, quibus Iohannes Caluinus illuſtriſſima Scripturæ ſacræ loca & teſtimonia de gloriosa Trinitate, Deitate Chriſti, & Spiritus Sancti, cum primis autem vaticinia Prophetarum de aduentu Meſſiæ, & Natiuitate eius, Paſſione, Reſurrectione, Aſſenſione ad cælos, & Seſſione ad dextram Dei, deteſtandum in modum corrumpere non abhorruit. Wittenbergæ. 1593. 4.

Caluinus Iudaizans, or Caluin playing the Iew: That is, A diſcouery (written by Egidius Hunnius) of the Iewiſh interpetations and Corruptions, by the which Iohn Caluin hath not beene affrayd to corrupt & abuſe the moſt euident places and teſtimonyes of holy Scripture, againſt the glorious Trinity, the Deity of Chriſt, and the Holy Ghoſt; as alſo the Predictions of the Prophets touching the comming of the Meſſias, his Natiuity, Paſſion, Reſurrection, Aſcenſion, and his Sitting at the right Hand of God.

Con-

5. *Conradi Schluſſenburgij Theologiæ Caluiniſticæ libri tres, in quibus, ſeu in tabula quadam quaſi ad oculum, pluſquam ex ducentis viginti tribus Sacramentariorum publicis ſcriptis, pagellis, verbis proprijs, & Authorum nominibus indicatis demonſtratur, eos de nullo ferè Chriſtianæ fidei articulo rectè ſentire.* Francofurti. 1594.

Three Bookes touching Caluiniſtical Diuinity, written by Conradus Schluſſenburge, in which bookes it is ſhewed (as in a Table to the eye) euē out of two hundred twenty and three publyke wrytings of the Sacramentaryes, with ſpeciall noting of the pages, the particular words, and names of the Authours, that the Sacramentaryes haue no true beliefe almoſt of any one Article of Chriſtian fayth.

6. *Pia defenſio aduerſus Iohannis Caluini, Petri Boquini, Theodori Bezæ, Gulihelmi Clebitij & & ſimilium calumnias. Item refutatio Pelagianæ Anabaptiſtici Caluiniſtarum erroris, de Baptiſmo & Peccato Originali. Adduntur Collectaneæ plurium Caluini, contra Deum, eius Prouidentiam & Predeſtinationem.* Erfordiæ. 1583.

A godly defence againſt the deceites of Iohn Caluin, Peter Boquinus, Theodore Beza, Wilhelmus Clebitius, and their Aſſociats. Alſo a Refutation of the Pelagian & Anabaptiſticall errour, taught by the Caluiniſts, touching Baptiſme & Originall ſinne.

Heere are alſo added certaine Collections out of Caluins wrytings, againſt God, his Prouidence, and Predeſtination.

7. *Denominatio Impoſturarum ac fraudum, quibus AEgidius Hunnius Eccleſiæ Orthodoxæ Doctrinam petulanter corrumpere pergit.* Bremæ. 1592.

A Catalogue of the Impoſtures & deceptes, wherewith Ægidius Hunnius doth inſolently go about to corrupt the doctrine of the Orthodoxe Church.

8. *Argumentorum & obiectionum de præcipuis articulis Doctrinæ Chriſtianæ, cum reſponſionibus, quæ ſunt collectæ ex ſcriptis Philippi Melanchonis: additis Scholijs illuſtrantibus vſum ſingularum reſponſionum, Partes 7.* Neapoli. 1578.

Arguments & Obiections concerning the chiefe Articles of Chriſtian Doctrine, with the Anſwers gathered out of the wrytings of Philip Melanchon: togeather with Commentaries vpon euery Anſwere, deuided into ſeauen Parts.

9. *Gulihelmi Zepperi Dillenbergenſis Eccleſiæ Paſtoris Inſtitutio, de tribus Religionis ſummis capitibus, quæ inter Euangelicos in Controuerſiam vocantur.* Hanouiæ. 1596.

In Inſtruction about three chiefe heads of Religiõ, called into Controuerſy among the Goſpellers: by William Zepperus Paſtour of the Church of Dillenberge.

Reſpon-

10. *Responsio triplex ad fratres Tubingenses, & triplex eorum scriptum de tribus grauissimis quæstionibus &c. De Cœna Domini, de maiestate hominis Christi, & de non damnandis Ecclesijs Dei non auditis, nec vocatis.* Geneuæ. 1582.

A threefold Answere to the Brethren of Tubinga & their threefold writing, concerning three most weighty Questions &c. Of the supper of the Lord; Of the Maiesty of Christ, as Man; And of not condemning the Churches of God, before they be heard, or called.

11. *Ad Iohannis Brentij argumenta, & Iacobi Andreæ Theses, quibus carnis Christi omnipræsentiã nituntur confirmare, id est, aduersum renouatos Nestorij & Eutichetis errores, Responsum.* Geneuæ. 1570.

An Answere to the Arguments of Iohn Brentius, & to the Conclusions of Iacobus Andreas, by which they endeauour to confirme the Vbiquity or presence of Christs flesh euery where: that is to say, against the renewed Errors of *Nestorius & Eutiches.*

12. *Apologia ad omnes Germaniæ Ecclesias reformatas, quæ sub Zwingliani & Caluiniani nominis inuidia, vim & iniuriã patiuntur.* Tiguri. 1578.

An Apology of all the Reformed churches of Germany, which through the Enuy of the Name of Zuinglius & Caluin, do suffer violence & iniury.

Chri-

Christophori Pezelij Apologia veræ doctrinæ, de definitione Euangelij: opposita Thrasonicis præstigijs Ioannis Wigandi. Wittenbergæ. 1572. 13.

An Apology of the true Doctrine concerning the Definition of the Ghospell, against the Thrasonicall enchantments of Ioannes Wigandus: by Christophorus Pezelius.

Colloquij Montisbelgardensis inter Iacobum Andreæ, & Theodorum Bezam Acta. Tubingæ. 1584. 14.

The Actes of the Colloquy at Montbelgard, betweene Iames Andrew, & Theodore Beza.

Veritatis victoria, & ruina Papatus Saxonici, Losannæ. 1563. 15.

The Victory of Truth, & the Ruine of the Popedome of Saxony.

Hamelmannia: siue Aries Theologizans. Dialogus oppositus duabus narrationibus historicis Hermanni Hamelmanni. Neostadij. 1582. 16.

Hamelmannia: or the Theologizing Ramme. A Dialogue against two Historicall Narrations of *Hermanus Hamelmannus.*

Christiani Kittelmanni decem graues & pernitiosi errores Zwinglianorum, in Doctrina de peccatis, & Baptismo: ex proprijs ipsorum libris collecti, & refutati. Magdeburgæ. 1562. 17.

Ten weighty & pernicious Errors of the Zwinglians, in the Doctrine concerning

Sinne & Baptisme. Collected out of their owne books & refuted: by Christianus Kittleman.

18. *Iohannis Mosellani Præseruatiua contra venenum Zwinglianorum.* Tubingæ. 1586.

An Antidote, or Preseruatiue against the poyson of the Zwinglians: by *Ioannes Mosellanus.*

19. *De Vnitate personali & supernaturali duarum Naturarum in Christo: contra blasphemam Disputationem Eusebij Cleberi Pastoris Saugalensis in Heluetia.* Tubingæ. 1586.

Of the Personall & Supernaturall Vnity of two Natures in Christ; against the blasphemous Disputation of *Eusebius Cleberus* Pastour of *Saugall*, in Suitzerland.

20. *De gaudijs æternæ vitæ: & quomodo Sacramentarij nobis illa gaudia imminuant.* Erfordiæ. 1585.

Of the Ioyes of Eternall life: And how the Sacramentaries, do in part defraude vs of them.

Now from all the premises aboue, I here conclude, that if the seuerall opinions among the Protestants be not in their iudgement maters of Indifferency; but are by themselues truly reputed for Heresies, & the maintayners of them not houldden to be in state of Saluation; as appeareth both from the Protestants reciprocall cõdemnations of one ano-

another, as alſo from the former Titles of their owne Bookes written againſt one another; then with much more reaſon may the ſame ſentence be pronounced of the many Irreconciliable Controuerſies, differently believed and houlden by the Catholikes and Proteſtants: And the rather ſince (as is aboue ſayd) there is a farre greater diſparity and difference of doctrine betweene the Catholikes and the Proteſtants, then betweene the Proteſtant, & the Proteſtant.

THE TRVTH OF THIS FORMER Doctrine, demonſtrated from the many Abſurdityes, neceſſarily accompanying the contrary doctrine.

CHAP. XVI.

SVCH is the ſweet Prouidence of *the Diuine Maieſty*, in diſpoſall of thinges, as that he euer cauſeth truth to be warranted with many irrefragable reaſons, and falſhood to be attended on with diuers groſſe and ineuitable abſurdityes; that ſo the iudgment of man may be the better ſecured for the imbracing of truth, and remayne the leſſe excuſable, if in place of truth it entertayne falſhood & Errour. Of the reaſons conuincing the infal-

lible truth of our doctrine maintayned in this treatise, I haue already discussed aboue, in the tenth Chapter. Now heere I will a little insist in discloſing the many and palpable absurdities, accompanying the contrary doctrine: which point will chiefly rest (besides some other short insertions) in a recapitulation of most of the former heads or braunches, aboue handled.

For if this doctrine were true, to wit, that euery one might be saued in his owne Religion; or that the beliefe only of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Passion, or the Creed were sufficient thereto, notwithstanding the beliefe of other erroneous opinions and heresies; Then would it follow, First,

1. that the holy Scriptures of Christ and his Apostles were most false, which haue inueyghed so much agaynst Heresies, and haue denounced the heauy iudgment of damnation agaynst the professours of them, as aboue is shewed; which comminations and threats the scripture in some places not only extendeth to all Hersies or Heretikes in generall, without (a) any limitation; but also in some other, they are particulerly restrayned to certayne Heresies, seeming of smaller importance then the denyall of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Passion, the Creed, &c. as is euident touching the denying (b) of marri-

(a) *Tit.* 3. *Gal.* c. 5. *Rom.* c. 16. 1. *Tim.* 1.
(b) 2. *Tim.* cap. 4. 2. *Tim.* c. 2. 1. *Ioan.* c. 2.

marriage, and of eating of certayne meates, and touching the Natures of Christ &c.

Now, that the denyall of other inferiour articles of fayth then of the Trinity, & Incarnation &c. is playne Heresy, is demonstrated aboue, both from the definition of Heresy, and from the iudgment of the Primitiue Church.

Secondly, the foresayd doctrine impugneth the definition of Fayth, giuen by the (f) Apostle; which definition of fayth comprehendeth a generall beliefe of all articles of Christian Religion, and is not therefore to be limited to any one kind of them. In like sort, it destroyeth the priuiledges & dignity of fayth, set down by the foresayd Apostle; who (g) promiseth saluation to him, that hath faith, as also that without fayth we cannot (h) please God: but such excellencies cannot be ascribed to a Bastard fayth, which believeth some thinges true, others false; they are therfore eyther to be giuen to a true entire, and perfect fayth in all points, or els the Apostle grossely erred in assigning to fayth the aforesayd priuiledges; seing a false fayth is no better, then no faith at all. Againe it depriueth a Christian faith of its true mark or character of *Vnity*, so much celebrated by the (h) Apostle.

2.

(f) *Hebr.* c. 11.

(g) *Mat. vltimo & Hebr.* 11.

(h) *Ephes.* 4. *Act.* 4. *Rom.* 12. &c.

(h) *Ephes.* 4. *Rom.* 12. *vide Cant.* c. 6.

Now then if *Vnity* of fayth be necessary

to Saluation, how can both Proteſtants and Catholikes expect ſaluation, ſeeing there is no greater diſtance betweene the oppoſite parts of a *Diameter*, then there is repugnancy betwixt both their beliefes. Therfore if both of them though wanting this *Vnity*, can be ſaued, then hath the Apoſtle falſely and erroneouſly deſcribed and delineated the faith of a Chriſtian.

3.

But to reflect vpon the former paſſages, is any man ſo ſtupid, as to dreame, that, this doctrine ſhould be true, which giueth ſo open a lye to ſo many vnanſwerable texts of Gods holy writ, touching the condemning of Heretiks in generall, as alſo touching the definition, excellency, and propriety of true Fayth? It is impoſſible, it is not to be imagined. Gods word is like himſelfe, moſt true, ſacred, and inuiolable, and therefore it iuſtly witneſſeth of it ſelfe, that (i) *ſcriptura non poteſt ſolui.* And agayne: (k) *Cælum & terra tranſibunt, verba autem mea non tranſibunt: Heauen and earth ſhall paſſe, but my wordes ſhall not paſſe.*

(i) Ioan. 10.
(k) Mat. 24.

But to proceed further touching the ſayd want of vnity, and diſagreements in Fayth; If euery Chriſtian might be ſaued in his owne Religion, then might thoſe be ſaued, which belieue the Articles of the creed in a moſt different ſenſe and manner; the

which

which what can be more raſhely and exorbitantly ſpoken? ſeeing there is but one true intended ſenſe, by the Apoſtles, of the creed; the which if we attayne not, then do we believe that, which is falſe; but to believe the creed in a falſe ſenſe, is no better, then not to believe it at all. And therefore it would follow by way of inference, that he might be ſaued, who believed not any one article of the creed at all. Now, that the Catholikes & Proteſtants doe believe the articles of the creed in different, or rather contrary ſenſes (and conſequently that the one ſide believeth it in a falſe and erroneous ſenſe) is aboue proued in the fourth chapter.

If it be heere replyed, that the maintayners of this doctrine do ſo far yield, that they only are to be ſaued, which in a true ſenſe believe the creed; yet by this their reſtraint they condemne al thoſe others, who believe it in any other ſenſe, different from that intended by the holy Ghoſt and the Apoſtles; and conſequently they condemne in their iudgement and depriue of ſaluation, eyther the Catholikes or Proteſtants; ſince of neceſſity the one of theſe do believe the creed not in the true, but in a falſe and hereticall ſenſe and conſtruction, different from that of the Apoſtles. But ſuppoſing that the Catholikes and Proteſtants believed the creed

in that true ſenſe, intéded by the holy Ghoſt; yet if our *Newtrallifts* would haue the creed the ſquare or rule, thereby to meaſure our fayth, then marke the Abſurdities following.

4. For by this doctrine one might be ſaued, who belieued not, that there were any Scriptures at all, written by the Prophets & Apoſtles (ſince the creed maketh no mention of any ſuch deuine writings.) In like ſort he might be ſaued, who did not belieue there were any Angells or Diuells; or that there is a materiall place of Hell; or that the paines thereof are eternall; or that Adam did preſently vpon his creation fall from grace, & thereby transferred Originall ſinne vpon all his poſterity; or that our Sauiour, whilſt he conuerſed heere on earth, wrought any myracles; or made choyce of certayne men to be his Apoſtles, to preach the Chriſtian fayth throughout all the whole world; or that he died for the ſaluation of mankind (for though we read in the creed, that he dyed and ſuffered, yet the end why he dyed is not expreſſed in the creed; Or that circumciſion is now forbiddem & antiquated; or finally, that there are any Sacramẽts of the new Teſtament, as Baptiſme, the Euchariſt &c. I ſay by our *Newtrallifts* Religion, he ſhould be ſaued, who belieued none of the foreſayd articles,

ticles; seeing not any one of them is expreſſed, or ſet downe in the Apoſtles creed; and yet the beliefe of the ſayd Articles is neceſſarily exacted and required to Saluation, in the iudgment both of Catholikes and Proteſtants; both which parties doe with an vnanimous conſent, teach the neceſſity of belieuing the ſayd articles. But to proceed further and to come to the different Articles of fayth, differenly belieued by the Catholike and Proteſtant, and yet not expreſſed in the creed; and articles of ſuch nature, as that they are houlden by the catholikes to be inſtituted by our Sauiour, as ſubordinate (yet neceſſary) meanes of the grace of God, and of our Saluation; whereas the Proteſtants, as not belieuing at all the ſayd articles, doe wholy diſclayme from acknowledging any ſuch meanes:

Theſe Articles I haue recited aboue, to wit: *That Sacraments in general do conferre grace: That a Child dying without Baptiſme, cannot be ſaued; That mortall ſinne is not remitted without the Sacrament of Pennance and Confeßion; That we are to adore with ſupreme Honour the bleſſed Sacrament; That not only fayth, but alſo works do iuſtifyman; That a Chriſtian by thinking himſelfe iuſt, is not thereby become iuſt; That euery Chriſtian hath by God ſufficient grace offered to ſaue his ſoule; And that therfore God on his part would haue all*

men ſaued; That without keeping the ten Commandements a man cannot be ſaued; Finally, that all Chriſtians ought vpon payne of eternall damnation, to communicate in Sacraments and doctrine with the Church of Rome, and to ſubmit themſelues in all due obedience to the ſupreme Paſtor of that Church: In all which points the Proteſtants doe believe directly the contrary, condemning vs of Hereſy, Superſtition, yea Idolatry, for our believing the foreſayd points. Now I ſay, ſeing the former articles doe immediatly touch and concerne eyther remiſſion of our ſinnes; or grace of our ſoule; or our Iuſtification; or our due honour and adoration to our Sauiours Body, being accompanyed with his diuinity; or Laſtly our communion with Chriſt his church and head thereof; in any of which (as concerning ſo neerly our eternall happynes) who erreth, cannot poſſibly be ſaued; And ſeing the Proteſtants (as is ſayd) doe in all the ſayd points maintaine the iuſt contrary to the catholikes, and therby do abandon the catholikes acknowledged meanes of their Salnation:

I heere aske in all ſobernes of iudgement, what can be reputed for a greater abſurdity, then to affirme with our *Newtralliſts*, that the 5. Catholikes and Proteſtants (notwithſtanding their ſo different & contrary beliefe & anſwerable practice in the former Articles,

ſo

ſo neerly touching mans Saluation) may both be ſaued? Seing it muſt needes be, that eyther the catholikes ſhalbe damned for ſetting downe certayne meanes of our Saluation, contrary to Chriſts mynd and Inſtitution (ſuppoſing the ſayd articles to be falſe;) or that the Proteſtants ſhalbe damned for reiecting the former meanes of Saluation, inſtituted by Chriſt, admitting them to be true.

6. But to paſſe forward. If euery Chriſtian might be ſaued in his Religion, in believing only the fundamentall points of the Trinity, the Incarnation &c. then hath the church of Chriſt eue in her Primitiue dayes (at what time the (*) Proteſtants themſelues exempt her from errour) moſt truly & inſufferably erred, in condemning certayne opinions (which are not fundamentall) for Hereſyes, and their maintayners for Heretikes; and conſequently the Scripture and Chriſt himſelfe haue deceaued vs, by aſcribing to the church an (m) infallibility of erring in her definitions of fayth, and condemnation of Hereſies, and by commaunding vs to obey the churches authority and ſentence in all things, as ſtyling her the *pillar and foundation of truth*. And further it ſhould follow, that the Church ſhould thus intollerably erre both in generall councells, (the higheſt Tribunalls

(*) D. Iewell in his defence of the Apology. Kemnitius in exam. Concil. Trident. part. 1. p. 74. & diuers others.

(m) *Mat.* 18. *Luc.* 10. 1. *Tim.* 3. &c.

bunalls heere vpon earth) as alſo in the priuate Authorities and ſentences of all the learned Fathers, in thoſe firſter tymes.

And thus for example, the councell of the (n) Apoſtles ſhould haue erred, in decreeing it vnlawfull to eate in thoſe tymes bloud & ſtrangled meates.

(n) *Act. 15.*

In like ſort the firſt councell of (o) Nice ſhould haue erred, in condemning the *Quartadecimani* for Heretiks, becauſe they would not keep Eaſter day, according to the cuſtome of the Church. And to pretermit all the other Councells, aboue alleadged, the Councell (p) of Rome vnder Cornelius, for condemning the Hereſy of the Nouatians (who reiected the Sacrament of Pennance) as alſo for condemning of Anabaptiſme.

(o) *Euſeb. l. 3. de vita Conſtant. Epiphan. hæreſ. 70.*

(p) *Euſeb. l. 6. Hiſt. cap. 33.*

And thus farre of Councels condemning points of ſeeming Indifferency, for open & wicked Hereſies. But now heere graunting that the ſayd points (as they were houlden by the maintayning of them) were not Hereſyes, & that the belieuers of them be ſaued, then two mayne abſurdities doe immediatly follow: the firſt, (as is ſayd) is the erring of the whole Church of God in cõdemning them for Hereſies, they being not Hereſies, but true doctrines.

7. The ſecond: the inconſiderate cariage of the Church in theſe matters. For to what end

end or purpose were all these Councells (consisting of many hundreds of the most graue and Reuerend men of all Christendome) celebrated with such labour, trauayle out of all countreys, & infinite charges, if the doctrines (for the impugning, resisting, and condemning whereof they were gathered) might be indifferently maintayned & defended on all sides, without breach of true fayth, or daunger of Saluation? The erring of the church is no lesse manifested, in the sentences and condemnations giuen by many of the most auncient, famous, & learned Fathers in the Primitiue Church (not any one Orthodoxall Father contradicting them therein) agaynst diuers, maintayning opinions that seemed, in regard of the Trinity, Incarnation, &c. of small importance; if so those opinions be not Heresies, nor the beliefuers of them Heretikes, but men in state of Saluatiō. And thus according heerto Florinus, though he taught God to be the Author of sinne, might be saued.

In like sort the Heretikes, who in S. Ierome his dayes denyed the possibility of the Commaundements; The Manichees, who denyed freewill; The Eunomians, who taught that only fayth doth iustify; The Aetians, who denyed prayer & sacrifice for the dead, and tooke away all fasting dayes; Vigilantius,

gilantius, who taught that Priests might marry, and that we ought not to pray to Saints; Iouinian, who held marriage better then virginity; The Donatists, who taught the Inuisibility of the Church; And finally (to omit many others for breuity sake) the Pelagians, who denyed the necessity of Baptisme in Children. All these men (I say) might be saued, notwithstanding their former doctrines, if so it be, that euery man might expect Saluation in their Religion. And yet we find, that the foresaid men were branded for wicked Heretikes, & their doctrines for damnable Heresies (as in the seauenth chapter aboue is shewed) by Ireneus, Ierome, Epiphanius, Philastrius, Augustine, Theodoret, and others; diuers of which holy Fathers, writing catalogues of Heresies did place the foresayd doctrines & their Authours within the sayd catalogues; & this they did without any reluctation or gain-saying of any other auncient and learned Father of their tymes.

8. From which consideration I doe gather, if those opinions were not iustly condemned for Heresies, and their Authours for Heretikes; Then not only the Church did fouly erre in so great a matter; but also euen the aforesaid alleadged Fathers, to wit, Ireneus, Ierome, Epiphanius, Austine, with many

many such others, should deseruedly be reputed for Heretikes, for their condemning of true Doctrines for Heresies, and the belieuers of them for Heretikes; and on the contrary syde, Florinus, the Manichees, the Eunomians, Vigilantius, Iouinian, the Donatists, Pelagius, & many other such, should be accompted for their teaching of true Doctrines, Orthodoxall Authors; and might haue iustly complayned of their insupportable wronges, and indignities proceeding from the pens of the foresaid fathers: An absurdity, which I thinke no man, enioying the benefit of his fiue senses, wil allow; And yet the admittance of our *Newtralists* Paradoxe, inanoidably draweth on this inferēce.

Another Absurdity accompanying the former doctrine is this; that Heretikes should be true members of Christs church. This I thus deduce; for seing by the consent of all learned men, none can be saued, but such as are true members of Christs church, (for otherwyse Turkes and Iewes dying in the state of Turcisme and Iudaisme, might be saued) and seing the foresaid registred Doctrines and their Authours are condemned for Heresies & Heretiks, both according to the Authority of Gods church, & according to the true definition of Heresy, aboue in the beginning set downe, (for the said Here-

9.

Heretikes haue made choyce of thoſe their hereſies, and do maintaine them moſt frowardly againſt the whole church of God, not ſubmitting their iudgments to it) muſt of neceſſity follow, that if thoſe men could be ſaued, then Heretikes (continuing Heretikes) are members of Chriſts true church: then which, what Paradoxe can in it ſelfe be accompted more abſurd? or in the iudgment of learned men more incredible? conſidering with what acerbity of comportement, the Apoſtles and all the Orthodoxall, learned, & pious Fathers, both in their wrytings and otherwyſe, haue in all ages entertayned Heretikes, as aboue I haue manifeſted.

10. Furthermore, if an Heretike (continuing an Heretike) can be ſaued, then hath the auncient church of Chriſt vſed great tyranny to diuers ſuch Profeſſours, by vndeſeruedly puniſhing ſuch mē with loſſe of Goods, Impriſonments, Excommunication, Baniſhment, & ſometymes with death it ſelfe; for ſuch were the puniſhments appointed by the auncient church, and Chriſtian Emperours againſt Heretyks, as I haue ſhewed in the nynth chapter. Againe, ſuppoſing the truth of the doctrine of theſe *Omniſidians*, yet obſerue how repugnant it is to all reaſon, and otherwiſe abſurde euen

in it

in it owne nature. I will heere passe ouer diuers reasons alleadged in the precedent Chapters, & insist a little in some few of them.

The first: It is certaine, that that Faith which belieueth some articles, and yet belieueth not other articles, which are no lesse true (and such is the fayth of our *Newtrallists*) is no true supernaturall fayth, seing it beleiueth nothing through the authority of God and his church, both which reueale & propound all articles alike and indifferently to all men to be beliewed: Now what more crosse to reason, then that a bare opinion not relying vpō any supernaturall grounds (as neither hauing *God for its Reuealer*, nor the *Church for its Propounder*) conceaued only through morall inducements (and therfore euer standing obnoxious to errour and mistaking) should be able to purchase eternall Saluation to mans soule? 11.

Againe, how aduerse is it to all true iudgment, to auerre, that it is no preiudice or hinderance to mans saluation, to belieue those principles of Religion, which teach & aduaunce all libertie & sensualitie in cōuersatiō & manners, & do depresse & disparage all Chastity, Fasting, voluntary Pouertie, keeping of the Commaundements, and finally all serious and painfull labours and 12.

works of vertue, piety, and mortification? for it is moſt contradictory in the very tearmes, and no leſſe repugnant to Gods ſacred word, that, that doctrine which (u) *promiſeth lybertie, and* (x) *transferreth the grace of God into wantonneſſe,* ſhould be accounted the (y) *ſtraite way which leadeth vnto lyfe.*

(u) 2. Pet. 2.
(x) Iudæ vers. 4.
(y) Mat. 7. Luc. 13. 13.

Furthermore, can it be conceaued, as ſorting to Gods moſt mercifull proceeding with man, that he ſhould cut off the liues of thoſe men with moſt fearefull, ſodaine, and prodigious deaths (and particulerly of Caluin, who was eaten away with lyce; a death, peculiar to diuers of Gods moſt capitall Enemyes, as to *Antiochus, Herod, Maximinus* & others) who firſt broached the Doctrines of Proteſtancy, if the ſayd Doctrines had either bene true in themſelues, or at leaſt of that coldnes and indifferency, as that they might comport and ſtand with the ſoules ſaluation? No. God is iuſt, & withall mercifull, & therfore neuer extraordinarily puniſheth, but for extraordinary ſinns. Poore men that they were, who comparted (as it ſhould ſeeme) both in the diuulging of their mendacious and lying Doctrines, as alſo in their vnexpected and ſudden deaths with the falſe Prophets (z) of Achab! But to haſten to an end, in the enumeration of the Abſurdities, following the foreſaid Paradox of ſalua-

(z) 3. Reg.

of ſaluation in euery Religion; and to come to that, which, within its owne largenes, inuolueth many improbabilities.

If Catholikes & Proteſtants (notwithſtanding the diſparity of their fayth) can both attayne to Heauen; in vayne then is the doctrine of *Recuſancy* ioyntly taught on both ſides; & in vayne haue ſo many ſcores of Reuerend and Learned Prieſts, and others of the Laytie, in our owne Countrey (whoſe bleſſed ſoules I beſeech to pray to God daylie, for the remiſſion of my many ſinnes) ſuffered cruell deaths, in the late Queenes raigne, only becauſe they refuſed to preſent themſelues at the ſeruice of the Proteſtants. But they are gone, and moſt happily gone; for (a) *Clauis Paradiſi ſanguis Martyrum*. In vayne likewyſe, theſe later yeares haue diuers lay Perſons endured (cõtrary to his Maieſties naturall inclination, moſt prone to mercy and commiſeration) great loſſes, diſgraces, and impriſonments only for the ſaid cauſe. 14.

(a) Tertul. de Præſcr.

But who can thinke that vertuous and learned men are ſo prodigall of their lyues and bloud, and Engliſh Lay Catholikes ſo inſenſible of their temporall ſtates, children, and poſterity, as that they would wilfully precipitate, and caſt themſelues into thoſe miſeries, only for not belieuing, and exerci- 15.

ſing points of Indifferencie, and ſuch as may ſtand with their ſoules eternall Happines?

16. In vayne alſo then haue the Learned men on both ſydes, ſpent out their whole liues in defending, ech man his owne Religion, in their moſt painfull, and voluminous bookes and wrytings, if ſo they diſſented one from another in matters of ſuch ſuppoſed ſmall importance.

17. In vayne, and without iuſt cauſe (and therfore moſt cruelly) haue many States in Chriſtendome in our age impoſed proſcription, baniſhments, and other inſupportable diſgraces to ſuch of their owne ſubiects, as will not imbrace their owne doctrine; though both ſydes did conſpire and agree in the fundamentall points of fayth.

81. In vayne alſo, both euer ſince Luthers reuolt, as alſo at this preſent, haue there byn and ſtill are, ſuch Inſurrections of Subiects againſt their Princes; ſuch bloudy and implacable warres betweene abſolute Princes themſelues; ſuch deuaſtation and depopulation of whole Countreys; ſuch maine battayles and fieldes fought with loſſe of diuers hundred thouſand lyues; and laſtly ſuch inceſſant and interrupted beſieging and taking of great Citties & townes, with effuſion (for the moſt part) of much innocent bloud,

bloud, of Women and Children; and all this originally and principally for matter of Religion: I ſay, in vayne, and moſt iniuriouſly haue all theſe attempts & actions byn vndertaken, if the diſagreements in Religiō (for which they were vndertaken) betweene Catholikes and Proteſtants, were of that reconcileable nature, as that the profeſſours on both ſydes (notwithſtāding their diuerſity of fayth) might ioyntly be ſaued.

What can we now reply heereto in the behalfe of our *Newtralliſts*? Shall we ſay, that the moſt learned men of all Religions, that Kings, Princes, States, and many hundred thouſand ſubiects of Chriſtendome, were (and ſtill are) actually mad, and out of their ſenſes, in menaging theſe their deplorable attempts for Religion? & that the all-reconciling & peaceable *Newtralliſt*, who (throgh his pliable ſterne of diſpoſition in theſe ſpirituall matters) is become of the halfe-bloud with the Atheiſt; and who wanteth (as is commonly noted) both learning, grace, & vertue, is particulerly enlightened by God, in ſetting downe what articles of fayth are only neceſſary to mans Saluation, and what are to be reputed but as acceſſory, and of ſmaller importance? To ſuch ſtraites (we ſee) is the defence of the former doctrine driuen vnto. Seeing therefore this doctrine of

our *Omnifidians*, or rather *Nullifidians* (for indeed, while they ſeeme to allow all Religions, they take away all Religion) is encompaſſed on all ſides with ſo many notorious abſurdityes (as are diſplayed in this Chapter,) and ſeing it cannot be true, except there be a retrogradation of all matters heere on earth, and a turning of the world (as they ſay) vpſide downe; that is, except the moſt learned become moſt madde, and the moſt ignorant moſt wiſe; Therfore ſince ſuch comportment and carriage of thinges is not ſorting to Gods Prouidence and Charity towards manking, let euery man (who thinketh he hath a ſoule to ſaue, or looſe) vndoubtedly aſſure himſelfe, that there is but one true Fayth or Religiō, wherin he may auaileably expect ſaluation; and that the ſauing fayth of Chriſt (wherewith the ſoule is cloathed) is like vnto the inconſutible garment of Chriſt, both being incapable of diuiſion, renting, or partition.

Now for the greater illuſtration of this point by way of ſimilitude, and as tending towards the cloſure of this treatiſe; Imagine that a man pretendeth right and title to certaine Lands, & taketh aduice of all the learned Lawyers & Coūſellours of the whole Realme, to whom he ſheweth all his Euidences; ſome of which Euidences do cary a

title

title only in groſſe and in generall, others proue a more particuler, & more reſtrayned right to the ſayd Lands: Imagine further, that vpon the diligent peruſall of theſe Euidences, the ioynt conſent and iudgment of all the ſayd Lawyers, ſhould after their longe and ſerious *Demurrs*, conſpyre in this one point; to wit, that for the recouering & obtayning of the ſaid Lands, the foreſhewed Euidences in generall are not ſufficient alone, ſeeing diuers other men, not hauing any true intereſt in the ſayd Lands, may neuertheleſſe inſiſt and vrge their like generall clayme; but that with the help of the ſayd Common Euidences, he muſt more punctually relye, for the gayning of his preſumed inheritance, vpon other more particuler, and perſonall Conueyances and Aſſigments.

Now all theſe learned Counſellours agreeing in this ſentence, & fortyfying their iudgments herein, with their owne experience in the like caſe, with the new *Reports* warranting the ſame, with the authority of all the auncient, learned, & Reuereð Iudges before them, & laſtly with the force of reaſon confirming no leſſe; If ſome one Empericke Atturney or other (skilfull only by a little experience in making a *Nouerint vniuerſi*) ſhould ſteppe forth (armed only with im-

pudency and ignorance) & pronounce the foresayd sentence of all those learned Sages to be false; and that the party pretending right to the sayd lands were sure by his generall Title and Euidences only, to obtayne the same, all other his more particuler Euidences being but vnnecessary & needeless theerunto; who might not heere iustly contemne, and reiect the rash censure of such a fellow? Or could not the party clayming the former inheritance, be worthily reprehended, if by reiecting the graue Counsell of the learned Lawyers, and following the aduyce of this ignorant man, should finally loose all clayme, title, and possibility to his sayd Inheritance?

Our case is not much vnlike heerto: Wee all pretend a right to the Inheritance of the kingdome of Heauen (for we reade, (*) *Coronam vitæ præparauit Dominus diligentibus se.*) Our title in generall therto is our belief in the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Passion, &c. (the belief whereof is most necessary, but not sufficient.) All eminēt men for learning (both Catholikes and Protestants) do proue from the Scriptures, from the authority of Gods Church, from the nature of Heresy, from the definition of true fayth, & from diuers other principles and reasons aboue expressed, that no man can attayne to his

(*) Iac. 1.

his heauenly Inheritance, by belieuing only the former fundamentall points of Christianitie, if so he haue not a true, and particuler fayth of many other lesse principall Articles of Christian Religion.

Nowe commeth heere a dissolute, gamneleſſe, & ignorant fellowe, not practised in any kind of good literature (for it is obserued (as aboue is sayd) that all our most forward *Neutralliſts* are mẽ for the most part voyde of Learning, Vertue, and Conscience) who perẽptorily out of his *Pythagorean* chayre (that is, without any proofe) affirmeth, that a beliefe in generall of the Articles of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Passion, is only sufficient to mans saluation; & that the doctrines of Purgatory, Freewil, Reall Presence, and other Controuersies betweene the Catholiks & Protestants, are not in any sort necessary to the purchasing of our eternall welfare, what way soeuer we hould, but are to be reputed (in respect of that end) points indifferẽt, vnauayleable, and as the Greeke is, meerely περίεργα, or Bye-matters: Who would heere not commiserate the folly, and ignorance of such a man; but especially pittie the soules seduced by so blind a Guyde?

THE

THE CONCLVSION *of the whole Treatiſe.*

CHAP. XVII.

HITHERTO (*Good Reader*) it is ſufficiently (I hope) demonſtrated, that euery Religion, though profeſſing the name of Chriſt, and belieuing in the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the like fundamentall points of chriſtian Fayth (if their beliefe in other ſecondary & leſſe principall points be erroneous) cannot promiſe to it ſelfe any ſecurity of Saluation; and conſequently that the controuerted articles at this day betweene Catholikes and Proteſtants touching Purgatory, Freewill, Praying to Saints, Sacrifice &c. are of that great importance, as that the profeſſours on both ſides (to vſe the phraſe of a bleſſed martyr * in the ſame caſe) *vnũ calũ capere non poteſt.*

(*) *Camp. in decem rationib. rat. 10.*

It now remayneth to ſhew, that ſeeing at this day, there are originally but two different Religions among chriſtians, to wit, the catholike Religion and the Proteſtant, (within which are included all its branches and deſcendents;) whether the catholike or the Proteſtant Religion is that, wherein a man may be ſaued. But ſeeing this Subiect

moſt learnedly and painefully intreated
, by many Catholike wryters, who from
authorities both Diuine & humane haue
efragably euicted the truth of their owne
eligion, and falſhood of the Proteſtants
oteſſion, (and conſequently that in the
tholike, not in the Proteſtant fayth, the
ules eternall happynes is to be purchaſed;)
erefore I doe remit the reader for his grea-
r ſatisfactiõ therin to the peruſal of the ſaid
ookes; & particulerly to the ſtudying (ra-
er thẽ to the reading only) of that moſt ela-
orate, learned, and vnanſwerable Worke
the Proteſtants Apology of the Roman Church.

Only before I heere end, I muſt make
ould to put the Reader in remẽbrance, with
hat the Proteſtant Religion in this former
reatiſe (though but caſually and incident-
y) is moſt truly charged; to wit, Firſt, with
articuler cõdemnations paſſed vpon diuers
its chiefeſt articles, euen by ſeuerall ſentẽ-
es & iudgements of the Primitime church;
nd that therefore thoſe doctrines ſo condẽ-
ed, & yet after defended with all froward
ertinacy agaynſt the church of God, are
hereby diſcouered for playne and manifeſt
Hereſies: this point being further euicted
mplicitely both from the teſtimonies of ho-
y Scripture, as alſo from the definition of
Hereſy aboue expreſſed. Secondly, that the 2.

doctri-

doctrinall ſpeculations and poſitions in t
Proteſtants fayth moſt ſtrongly mooue t
Wills of ſuch, as beliefe them, to all vice,
berty, and ſenſuality. Thirdly, that God
3. of the infinite abiſme of his Iuſtice, hath p
niſhed euen in this world (as earneſt giuen
far greater puniſhment, reſerued in the
to come) with moſt fearefull, vnnaturall,
prodigious deaths, the firſt Inuētours in
age, & Promulgatours of the ſayd doctrine
and ſuch deathes, as his diuine Maieſty is a
cuſtomed to ſend to his profeſſed enemyes
4. Fourthly, that Proteſtancy is torne aſunde
with inteſtine diuiſions; diuers Profeſſou
of it, charging their Brethren-Profeſſou
with Hereſy, & deſpayring of their futu
ſaluatiō. From all which we may conclud
that except Hereſy, diſſolution of manner
moſt infamous and calamitous deathes, an
diſagreements in doctrine betweene one &
the ſame ſect, be good diſpoſitions & mean
to purchaſe Heauen, the Proteſtant Religio
can neuer bring her Belieuers thereto.

What then remayneth, but who will ex-
pect ſaluatiō, ſhould ſeeke it only in the Ca-
tholike Church? it being that *Arke* erected
by our ſecond *Noë*, within which who tru-
ly belieue and liue vertuouſly, are exempted
from that vniuerſall deluge of eternall dam-
nation. For only in this Church is profeſſed
and

taught *that Fayth*, to which by long pref- (a) *Pacian. Epist. ad Sympron. quæ est de Nomine Catholico.*
iption, & a continued hand of tyme, is pe-
liarly ascribed the name *Catholike*: (a) *Ca-*
tholicum istud, nec Marcionē, nec Apellem, nec Mon-
tanum sonat, nec Hæreticos sumit autores. That
yth, which was propheſied to be of that (b) Esa. 2. & expoūded in the Englisſh Bibles of the yeare 1568. *Of the vniuersality of the Church or fayth of Christ.*
lating and spreading nature, as that to it *all*
Nations shall follow, & which shall haue the
end of the earth for its posession, from sea to sea,
beginning (c) *at Hierusalem, among all nations.*
at Fayth, the Professours whereof shalbe
(f) *Kingdome, that shall neuer be destroyed*, but
all stand for euer; cōtrary to the short cur-
nts of all Hereſyes, of which S. Auguſtine
us wryteth: (g) *Many Hereſies are already dead;*
ey haue continued their streame, as long as they
re able; now they are runne out, and their ryuers
e dryed vp; the memory of them (that euer they
ere) is now scarce extant. That *fayth*, the mem-
ers whereof, in regard of their euer visible
minency, are stiled by the holy Ghoſt, *A*
mountayne prepared in the top of mountaynes, &
alted aboue Hills: with reference wherto
o wit, in respect of the Churches continu-
l visibility) the foresayd S. (i) Auguſtine
mpareth it, *to a Tabernacle in the Sunne.* That
yth, whose vnion in doctrine both among
the

(c) Pſal. 2. & expoūded *of the Churches vniuersality*, by the foresayd Englisſh Bibles of the yeare 1576.
(d) Pſal. 72.
(e) Luc. 4. (f) Dan. 2. in which is included *the vninterrupted continuance of the Church.* (g) In pſal. 57. (h) Esa. 2. wherby is proued the Churches euer visibility. (i) Tom. 9. in Ep. Ioan. tract. 2.

the professours thereof, and with their hea
is euen celebrated by Gods holy writ; sin
the Church of God is therefore (k) called
Body, one spouse, and one sheepfould: which pr
uiledge S. (l) Hierome acknowledgeth
his owne submission, in these words: *I*
consociate, or vnite my selfe in Communion with
Chayre of Peter; *I know the Church to be build*
vpon that Rocke; *whosoeuer doth eate the La*
out of this house, is become prophane.

That fayth, for the greater confirmatio
whereof, God hath vouchsafed to disioy
the setled course of Nature, by working
uers stupendious & astonishing (*) miracle
according to those wordes of our Sauios
(m) *Goe, preach you, cure the sicke, rayse the du*
cleanse the leapers, cast out diuells &c. A Preto
gatiue so powerfull and efficacious with
Augustine, as that he expresly thus confesse
of himselfe: (n) *Miracles are among those thing*
which most iustly haue boulden me in the Church
bosome.

To conclude, omitting diuers other Ch
racters (as I may tearme them) or signes
the true fayth; *That fayth*, which is of th
force, as to extort testimony, and warra

(k) Rom. 12. Cant. 6. Ioan. 10. *Which places prooue the Churches vnity.*
(l) Epist. ad Damasum.
(*) See examples hereof in Ierome in vita Hilarionis. Athanasius in vita Antonij. Theodoret. hist. l. 5. c. 21. Eusebius histor. l. 7. c. 14. Zozomenus hist. l. 3. c. 23. August. l. de ciuit. Dei 22. c. 8. & l. 9. Confess. c. 7. & 8.
(m) *Mat.* 10. in which wordes o
Sauiour maketh miracles a signe of true fayth, or of t
Church.
(n) Tom. 6. contra Epist. Manichæi cap. 4.
(o) *De*
ueron. 32. which words include the confession of the Aduersary to be a note of truth,

for it ſelfe, euen from it moſt capitall and deſigned enemyes; anſwereably to that, (o) *Our God is not as their Gods are, our enemies are euen witneſſes*; ſince the Proteſtants no leſſe from their owne (p) practice, then from their (q) acknowledgment in words, doe aſcribe to our Roman fayth the hope of Saluation. Of which ſubiect ſee moſt amply in the forſayd learned booke of the Proteſtants Apology, *Tract. 1. Sect. 6. ſubdiuiſ. 1. & 2. & 3.* as alſo *Tract. 2. cap. 2. Sect. 14.*

To this Fayth then, with an indubious aſſent, adhere both liuing & dying; flye *Newtralliſme* in doctrine, as the bane of all Religiõ; flye Proteſtancy, as the bane of Chriſts true Religion, and ſay with (r) Pacianus; *Chri-*

(p) This is proued, in that Proteſtants, doe not rebaptize Infants or children of Catholike Parẽts, afore baptized: now theſe Infants are baptized in the fayth of their Parents, as all childrẽ

are, euen by the doctrine of all Proteſtants. But if this faith of Catholike Parents be ſufficient for the Saluation of their Children dying baptized therin, then much more is it ſufficient for the ſaluation of the Parents themſelues: ſince it is moſt abſurd to ſay, that the Catholike faith of Parents ſhold be auaylable for their Children or Infants, dying baptized therin, & yet not auaylable for the Parents themſelues. (q) According heerto (to omit the lik teſtimonies of many other Proteſtants) *D. Some* in his defence againſt *Penry*. p. 182. thus writeth: *If you thinke, that all the Popiſh ſort, which dyed in the Popiſh Church, be damned, you thinke abſurdly, & diſſent from the iudgment of all learned Proteſtants.* With whom *D. Couell* in his defence of *M. Hookers* fiue bookes of Eccleſiaſticall Policy p. 77. thus conſpireth, ſaying: *VVe affirme, that thoſe who liue & dye in the Church of Rome, may be ſaued.* (r) Pacian. Ep. ad Symphron.

Christianus mihi nomen est, Catholicus verò cognomen; illud me nuncupat, istud me ostendit: A Christian is my name, a Catholike my Syrname; that doth denominate me, this doth demonstrate me.

FINIS.